

# On the emergence of quantum mechanics, diffeomorphism invariance and the weak equivalence principle from deterministic Cartan-Randers systems

November 19, 2021

Ricardo Gallego Torromé<sup>1</sup>  
Departamento de Matemática  
Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil

## Abstract

In this work, deterministic Cartan-Randers dynamical systems, a particular class of *deterministic quantum models* associated to first order ordinary differential equations are considered. Then we show that *diffeomorphism invariance*, a classical and a quantum versions of a Principle of Inertia, reversibility of the effective quantum dynamics and a *covariant maximal universal acceleration* emerge from deterministic Cartan-Randers models. A geometric analytic mechanism for quantum measurement processes without reduction of wave packet appears naturally. The mechanism is applied heuristically to the quantum two slit experiment. The mechanism allows for protective measurement and usual Von Neumann measurements. Furthermore, a similar geometric-analytic mechanism is discovered to produce a lower bound for physical values for the eigenvalues of Hamiltonian for matter. As a side effect of such mechanism, a natural explanation for the Weak Equivalence Principle is obtained. This fact together with the emergence of classical diffeomorphism invariance make stronger the case for the emergent origin of the gravitational interaction. An abelian gauge structure associated with a phenomenological relativistic quantum description of Cartan-Randers systems appears. This structure is related with representations of the Lorentz group in a phenomenological description of the Cartan-Randers models. We explore specific models of relativistic quantum mechanics and field theories as phenomenological descriptions of Cartan-Randers models. Finally, we point out several open questions in the new formalism and we discuss its relation with other emergent quantum mechanics and foundational quantum frameworks.

**Keywords:** emergent quantum mechanics, emergence gravity, emergence of space-time, emergence of quantized time, Cartan spaces, Randers spaces, maximal acceleration, concentration of measure, dissipative dynamics, ergodicity, time symmetric dynamics, quantum measurement, quantum two slit experiment, protective measurements, non-linear sigma models.

## 1 Introduction

In a geometric and realistic departing point of view about the physical world, each our experiences with physical systems should be referred to space-time representations. This is possible a dream and therefore, difficult or impossible to realize. However, if we look to our present formulation of the fundamental laws in physics, their formulation implicitly assume the existence of a geometric space where *things happen*. This fundamental remark also applies to the quantum theory, including measurement processes, where the space-time is the spectrum of certain covariant commutative space-time algebra (the *operator positions algebra*). Furthermore, after the advent of general relativity, the space-time structure becomes dynamical and is not a back-ground and the geometry is described by falsifiable models. In general relativity, the commutative algebra of position operators must be dynamical. Also, one expects that global formulations to be necessary by consistency. This is a difficult problem, from where one can understand the strong difficulties in reconciling the physical, dynamical space-time

---

<sup>1</sup>email: rigato39@gmail.com

general relativity models with the principles of quantum mechanics. This is a direct formulation of the problem of quantum gravity.

Different to the problem of quantum gravity and in principle more accessible, there is the problem of the representation of quantum phenomena in a fixed back-ground space-time. Even if it is an approximation to the more realistic problem of quantum gravity, the space-time representation in Minkowski space-time of a quantum measurement process could be meaningful, even if only as an approximation description to a more accurate description. However, the Minkowski space-time representation of measurement processes is a difficult task. This is not too surprising, since the usual interpretation of the quantum measurement involves the notion of instantaneous reduction of the wave packet, which is clearly against any possible Minkowski space-time representation. The unification of quantum mechanics with special relativity through quantum field theory is only a partial solution to the problem, since measurement processes are not considered in the relativistic quantum field framework. Moreover, proposals to reconcile the measurement process with space-time representation involve hypothesis that are quite difficult to falsified [20].

Due to the difficulties with the space-time interpretation of the quantum processes and if we assume that fundamental physical phenomena must be representable in a space-time, it is reasonable to doubt that the quantum formalism is the ultimate framework for describing physical processes. Clearly, the problem of understanding quantum measurement processes is not only formal, but related with the logical and mathematical structure of the quantum theory itself and with the ontological interpretation of the fundamental physical processes compatible with the quantum theory.

The quantum interference phenomena also appears difficult to be represented in a space-time picture. The essence of the problem after some simplification can be formulated as follows:

*Is there a causal and local space-time representation of the double slit quantum interference experiment?*

As R. Feynman discussed in his Lectures, to find such representations is a difficult task, because the seemingly dependence of the measurable values of the experimental setting and reduction of the state interpretation in quantum mechanics ([22], Vol. III, Chp. 03). Therefore, it should not be a surprise if in order to have a deeper understanding of fundamental physical processes, our standard notion of smooth space-time or the foundations of the quantum theory or both need of fundamental revision.

A general class of pre-quantum frameworks are recognized under the name of *emergent quantum mechanics*. They share the idea that the quantum formalism arises from an underlying, more fundamental theory. We cannot make full justice here to the whole contribution to the topic, but let us mention as examples of emergent quantum frameworks the theories (not necessarily deterministic) developed in [2, 9, 10, 18, 25, 35, 52, 59]. There are also arguments that suggest that quantum mechanics appears as a *thermodynamic limit* of a more fundamental dynamics [1, 21].

Without being *hidden variable theories* in the usual sense, emergent frameworks aim to reproduce quantum mechanics from a more fundamental theory and to obtain observable deviations from the standard quantum mechanical predictions. In emergent quantum frameworks, the *fundamental degrees of freedom* are not necessarily the same than the degrees of freedom associated with sub-atomic, atomic, molecular or macroscopic classical systems. Thus, different emergent frameworks could differ on the choice of fundamental variables, the fundamental dynamics and their relations with macroscopic dynamics and fields.

For ontologically realistic approaches to the quantum mechanical formalism, Bell's inequalities and their experimental violations impose fundamental constraints. However, there are mechanisms in quantum deterministic frameworks to avoid the applicability of Bell's inequalities in such a way that the experimentally confirmed violation of the inequalities does not have ontological consequences. For instance, at the energy scale where the deterministic models applies, the group symmetry invariance is not large enough that can be used to construct non-trivial representations of the rotation group as subgroup [25], which is a necessary condition to formulate the Bell's inequalities that are currently tested in experiments. Also, it has been argued the impossibility to construct the full set of states required to formulate Bell's inequalities [38]. Other argument used to avoid the validity of Bell's inequalities assumes a *superdeterministic* description of physical systems [37].

A common characteristic of emergent quantum mechanics is the existence of dissipation of information. For dissipative systems with a large number of degrees of freedom, a probabilistic description is useful, due to the difficulties to describe all the details of a particular solution. Indeed, from the point of view of the emergent frameworks (in the contest of deterministic quantum mechanics), this is the underlying reason explaining the success in the use of probabilistic methods in the description of atomic and sub-atomic systems.

A fundamental difficulty in some deterministic quantum models is that the associated Hamiltonian operators are not bounded from bellow (since the highest order in momentum operators is one). The mechanism proposed in the literature to solve this problem involves a dissipative dynamics [9, 18, 35]. In those proposals, the gravitational interaction plays an essential role as the origin of the information loss dynamics and must be

present at the level of the fundamental dynamics. However, gravity could be itself an emergent phenomenon [40, 39, 63], not present at the scale energy where the dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom happen. If this is the case, it is difficult to appeal to gravity as the origin of dissipation of information for the fundamental dynamics and another general mechanism should be source of dissipation. Instead, one can argue that both the dissipation of information and the gravitational interaction have a partial common origin. The present work introduces a probabilistic mechanism for information loss in deterministic quantum models without involving gravity directly with a mechanism based on principles of mathematical analysis and probability theory.

Our goal is to find dynamical systems as models for a theory beneath quantum mechanics, such that the following properties hold:

- A.1. There exist fundamental and universal scales for the difference on the coordinate of microscopic events and for the *elementary lapses of external time parameter*  $\tau \in \mathbf{R}$ . The degrees of freedom whose dynamics happen at these fundamental scales correspond to the *fundamental degrees of freedom*.
- A.2. The fundamental degrees of freedom are deterministic and local. In particular, the models are described by first order ordinary differential equations in terms of an externally observable time parameter  $\tau$  (if we assume that the time  $\tau$  is approximated by a continuous parameter) or by finite difference equations (if  $\tau$  is considered to be a discrete time parameter).
- A.3. The fundamental degrees of freedom are undistinguishable *fundamental molecules* composed by two *fundamental atoms*: one that evolves in the positive direction of internal time  $t$  and another that evolves in a negative direction of time  $t$ .
- A.4. The following *locality condition* holds: given a *system*  $\mathcal{S}$  corresponding to fundamental molecules, there is a small neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}$  such that only  $\mathcal{U}$  acts on the system  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- A.5. The following *causality condition* holds: there is a maximal, universal bound for the speed of the fundamental atoms. We assume that such maximal speed is the speed of the light in vacuum.
- A.6. The internal dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom and that of the fundamental atoms has a regime which is ergodic. Therefore, time averaging along a trajectory of a molecule during the internal time can be substituted by phase averaging in each fiber of the phase space. This is the first regime in the *internal evolution*.
- A.7. The fundamental dynamics is information loss, with a large number of fundamental states of freedom evolving towards the same equilibrium state after a finite evolution along the internal time  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This is the second regime in the internal evolution.

The above assumptions are not axioms for the dynamical systems that we will consider in this work. The above assumptions are natural to hold in deterministic systems associated with a fundamental scale if fundamental processes have a geometric representation. They are assumptions that hold for classical systems. Also, these assumptions constraint significantly the compatible mathematical models. Since they are not axioms, some of the assumptions could be logically dependent from others and logically deducible.

### Remarks on the assumptions.

1. A sharper phenomenological description of the external time evolution for deterministic degrees of freedom requires the use of finite difference equations and a notion of *discrete macroscopic time*. However, the use of a continuous time parameter  $\tau$  for the external dynamics does not affect the considerations made in this work. Indeed, the continuous dynamics can be taken as an approximation to the discrete dynamics in the limit when the fundamental lapse of time is very short compared with macroscopic time measurements.
2. The existence of a *quantum of time* is related with an anti-de Sitter version of Caldirola's hypothesis of the quantum of time or *chronon* [14]. However, in our proposal, quantization of external time will emerge and is not postulated.
3. A Lorentz covariant version of external time quantization should have besides a *quantum of time* an universal maximal speed. This is realized if the theory contains a fundamental length and time scales. For instance in the Snyder's quantum-space model as an abstract realization of an five-dimensional abstract  $(2, 3)$  anti-de Sitter space [60]. In this case the spectrum of the space-time algebra is a discrete space-time where the Lorentz group acts tensorially.

4. If the distinction between  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is sharp, the initial conditions for the deterministic systems are assumed to exist, even if an observer is not able to determine them. Each fundamental system  $\mathcal{S}$  has a given and in practice un-repeatable (because the complexity and the large number of degrees composing the system) initial conditions. However, such a sharp distinction between  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is arguable exists. If the answer is negative, a fuzzy description appears natural.
5. It is not logically necessary to assume that the fundamental scale is the Planck scale. Indeed, since we cannot establish the particular value of the fundamental scale from the above assumptions, we leave open the concrete specification of the fundamental scale and its physical interpretation. However, we will argue that a fundamental scale considerably larger the Planck length and time scale is disfavored in the framework that we are developing by general heuristic arguments.
6. The assumption A.3 has a formal similarity with the fundamental assumption in Wheeler-Feynman theory of backward-forward symmetric solutions in classical electrodynamics [66]. At the formal level, the main difference between the idea in Wheeler-Feynman theory of time symmetrization of the solutions of Maxwell's equations and our proposal of symmetrizing the internal time evolution is that the dynamics that we consider for the fundamental degrees of freedom is based in a back-ground non-reversible Cartan-Randers geometry. This produces a net difference between back and forward evolution for individual fundamental atoms, providing an irreversible arrow of time at the fundamental level.
7. Apparently related with the assumption A.3 is the two vector formalism in quantum electrodynamics [3, 4, 64, 65]. We will discuss later the relation of this formalism with our assumption A.3 and show that such relation is only formal.

A direct consequence of the assumptions A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4 and A.5 is the existence of a *maximal universal acceleration* for fundamental atoms and molecules. Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is the region in the space time that can affect the dynamics of  $\mathcal{S}$ , there is associated a *minimal length*. Then the maximal elementary mechanical work as a result of the action of  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  is

$$L_{min} m a \simeq \frac{1}{2} (\delta m v_{max}^2 + m(\delta v)_{max}^2),$$

where  $a$  is the value of the acceleration in the direction of the total exterior effort is done and the parameter  $m$  is the inertial mass of the fundamental atom. Since the speed of any physical degree of freedom is bounded by the hypothesis of locality A.4,  $\delta v_{max} = v_{max} = c$ . The maximal work produced by the system on a point particle is when  $\delta m \simeq m$ . Thus, there is an universal bound for the value of the coordinate acceleration  $a$  for the fundamental atoms,

$$a_{max} \simeq \frac{c^2}{L_{min}}. \quad (1.1)$$

Therefore, if the above assumption A.1, A.2, A.4 and A.5 hold, the mathematical formalism for the deterministic models should contain a maximal universal acceleration. If in addition, the assumption A.3 holds, there is also a maximal acceleration for the di-atomic fundamental molecules.

This heuristic derivation of an universal maximal acceleration for fundamental systems differs from Caianiello's original derivation of the existence of maximal accelerations [13] in the framework of his *quantum geometry* [12] and system theory. Although in Caianiello's derivation was used the causality condition of a limit speed for matter, the second fundamental assumption was the non-degeneracy of a associated Fisher-type pseudo-Riemannian metric in a cotangent space of a point particle (Caianiello's quantum geometry). Furthermore, in Caianiello's theory maximal acceleration depends on the mass of the system, while in the dynamical systems that we are considering the maximal acceleration is universal.

The hypotheses of maximal speed and fundamental quantum of time appears in Caldirola's theory of the relativistic point charged particle [14]. From such principles, it is easily deduced the existence of a maximal acceleration, that depends on the mass of the point charged particle [15]. Our heuristic derivation above of the maximal acceleration differs from Caldirola's, although they are related by dimensional analysis arguments. However, a main difference is that as result of the assumption A.1, the maximal acceleration depends on  $L_{min}$ , which is universal and mass independent.

Therefore, it is natural that we require the following additional assumption to our dynamical systems,

- A.8. There is a maximal, universal acceleration for both fundamental atoms and fundamental di-atomic molecules.

A framework for deterministic systems with maximal acceleration and maximal speed such that the assumptions A.1 to A.8 hold is provided by *deterministic Cartan-Randers systems*<sup>2</sup> (in short, DCRS). Deterministic Cartan-Randers systems are based on a general correspondence between systems of first order differential equations and *time oriented symmetrized Cartan-Randers metrics*, defined on a convenient cone of the cotangent bundle  $T^*TM$  (see for instance [50] for the notion of Cartan spaces and [6, 7, 49, 56] for the notion of Randers space in different contexts). In a DCRS, the classical Hamiltonian function, that is linear in the momentum coordinates, is *weakly averaged* on a submanifold (not necessarily compact) of the cotangent space and also averaged on the *internal time evolution direction*. The average on the internal time evolution direction corresponds to a *symmetrization* of fundamental irreversible evolution. The averaged in time Hamiltonian describes the dynamics of the fundamental molecules postulated in the assumption A.3. The *measurable states* are the zero modes of the *totally averaged Hamiltonian*. They appear as stationary, localized states whose properties external observers can measure by performing quantum measurements. Furthermore, if the zero eigenstates of the totally averaged Hamiltonian are the states that we can observe macroscopically, the diffeomorphism invariant property of macroscopic models automatically emerges.

Another fundamental difficulty associated with deterministic quantum models is the relation between the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale with the degrees of freedom at subatomic, atomic and classical scales. However, some relevant results have been obtained. In particular, it has been shown that some  $(1+1)$ -bosonic quantum field models and some string models can be interpreted as deterministic quantum models [36, 37]. The same can happen for other Lagrangian field models.

**Structure of the work.** In this work it is shown how the quantum mechanical phenomenology emerges from DCRS. We start describing the relation between the Hamiltonian formulation of first order dynamical systems and a symmetrization on time operation involving Cartan spaces of Randers type. This construction is based on the relation between Hamiltonian systems and Cartan spaces through the calculus of variation: the geodesic equation of a Cartan metric corresponds to the Hamilton equations for a DCRS (the Lagrangian version of this correspondence is that the Euler-Lagrange equations corresponds to the geodesics equations of an associated Finsler structure). When the symmetrization operation is applied to a Cartan-Randers space the result is a DCRS. There are some phenomenological consequences for the relation first order dynamical system  $\Leftrightarrow$  DCRS. In particular, the quantum version of the *Principle of Inertia* is obtained. As a consequence, the classical version of the Principle of Inertia also holds. Invariance under diffeomorphism are proved to hold in DCRS instead of being postulated. Further phenomenology involves the existence of maximal acceleration and speed for quantum mechanical systems, as direct consequence of the definition of the observable speed and acceleration as the one corresponding to the it center of mass of the DCRS.

In *section 3* we discuss the symmetries of a general DCRS with a discrete (although large) number of real degrees of freedom.

*Section 4* is dedicated to construct local phases from the original degrees of freedom of a DCRS and to make the transition from discrete degrees of freedom (associated with a DCRS) to continuous degrees of freedom (associated with wave functions).

In *Section 5* the fundamental mathematical notions of the quantum theory are derived from DCRS and from the mathematical theory of asymptotic geometric phenomena, in particular as an application of the concentration of measure phenomena [31, 34, 42, 43, 47, 62]. We start with a derivation of Born's rule of quantum mechanics. In the way, we are able to define density probability functions and show how a (finite dimensional) Hilbert space structure emerges from DCRS. A description of the quantum measurement process for a quantum system without introducing the quantum state reduction hypothesis is explained. The mechanism proposed is based on a general principle of *the measure concentration phenomena*. We use these ideas, a landmark of modern mathematical analysis, to describe an heuristic picture of the quantum two slit experiment. Notably, this picture is in concordance with current experiments that demonstrate an unconventional *fuzzyness* in the discrimination between the wave and the particle nature of any quantum system [51, 32, 46], in contrast with Bohr's complementary interpretation. Our mechanism for quantum measurement allows for the possibility of protective measurements [4, 64].

In *section 6*, after canonical quantization, it is shown how the averaged dynamics provides a natural solution to the problem of the un-boundedness from below of the linear quantum Hamiltonian for deterministic models. The mechanism works as follows. First, note that the energies of a system are measured in a measurable state. For such states, the total Hamiltonian is constrained to be zero. The observable energy of a state is decomposed as the energy of the matter component and gravitational energy. If the gravitational component of the energy is finite, the matter component of the energy must also be finite and therefore, bounded from below. The

---

<sup>2</sup>In ref. [25] such dynamical systems were called *deterministic Finslerian models*. We have adopted here the most appropriated denomination of deterministic Cartan-Randers systems, since they are constructed using as a back-ground a Cartan spaces [50] of *Randers type* [56].

mechanism to prove this important result is based again in the concentration of measure phenomena. Thus, the Weak Equivalence Principle is emergent in DCRS. This fact together with the emergence of the classical Principle of Inertia and diffeomorphism invariance, makes reasonable to conjecture that gravity ins emergent phenomena in DCRS.

In *section 7* we show that any DCRS can be described by phenomenological Lagrangian densities with the same symmetries as the original DCRS model. The phenomenological Lagrangian models can be quantized (for instance, by using path integral methods), providing an effective action functionals for the fundamental DCRS systems. We present in this work a family of Lagrangian densities models that are phenomenological descriptions of DCRS. This family of Lagrangian densities is limited by symmetry and representation theory arguments. This limitations must be considered as a constraint on the possible physical models. Two particular Lagrangian models are written, corresponding to a non-linear sigma model and to a supersymmetric non-linear model in four dimensions.

A short discussion of the DCRS framework, indicating some limitations of the present work, is sketched in *section 8*. This indicates natural directions for further research. We emphasize the prediction of the existence of a universal maximal acceleration with value of order  $10^{52}m/s^2$ , if the fundamental scale is the Planck scale. The relation with other frameworks of deterministic models is also indicated.

## 2 Deterministic Cartan-Randers systems

**The geometric back-ground structure.** A deterministic Cartan-Randers system is a dynamical system characterized by the following elements. First, there is a *configuration manifold*  $M$  and an *external time parameter*  $\tau$ . The physical meaning of  $M$  is based in the following interpretation. Each point  $u \in TM$  describes a possible *multiple event* with defined locations and speeds of the collection of all the *fundamental degrees of freedom* of the physical system. These fundamental molecules are *di-atomic* molecules as in assumption A.3. We assume that the dynamical changes of the fundamental atoms happen at scales of length and time much smaller than the Standard Model scales. A natural energy scale for them is the Planck scale, because the well known argument on the need of a quantum description of the gravity when the event horizon of a mini-black whole is of the size of the associated Compton length.

The dimension of the tangent space  $TM$  is  $\tilde{N} = 2 \dim(M)$ . There is also a *space-time model four-manifold*  $M_4$  and it is assumed that  $M$  has a product structure of the form

$$M = \prod_{k=1}^N \times M_4^k \quad (2.1)$$

with each  $M_4^k$  diffeomorphic to  $M_4$ . It is assumed that the natural number  $\tilde{N} = 8N$  is large compared with the natural number  $p = 2 \dim(M_4) = 8$ . Each of the fundamental molecules is labeled by the natural number  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . There is a configuration manifold  $M_4^k$  as the configuration space for the  $k$ -molecule. The dimension  $\dim(TM_4^k) = p = 8$  corresponds to four space-time coordinates  $(\xi^0, \xi^1, \xi^2, \xi^3)$  for the point  $\xi(k) \in M_4^k$  and four independent velocities coordinates  $T_\xi M_4^k \ni (\dot{\xi}^0, \dot{\xi}^1, \dot{\xi}^2, \dot{\xi}^3)$ . The tangent configuration space for a classical gas of point particles is a smooth manifold  $M$  of the form

$$TM \cong \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus TM_4^k. \quad (2.2)$$

The model manifold  $M_4$  is endowed with a Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$  of signature  $(1, -1, -1, -1)$ . The metric  $\eta_4$  is a background, non-dynamical structure. For each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  there is a Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4(k)$  on  $M_4^k$ . For simplicity, we will assume that all the structures  $\{(M_4^k, \eta_4(k), k = 1, \dots, N\}$  are all isometric to  $(M_4, \eta_4)$ .

Given the above geometric structure, there is a pseudo-Riemannian metric  $\eta_S^*(k)$  defined on  $TM_4^k$  (the Sasaki-type metric), which is the horizontal lift (using the Levi-Civita connection of  $\eta_4(k)$ ) of the metric  $\eta_4$  on  $M_4^k$  to  $TM_4^k$ . The dual metric of  $\eta_S^*$  is the dual pseudo-Riemannian metric  $\eta_S(k) = (\eta_S^*(k))^*$ . The dual Sasaki-type metric  $\eta_S$  allows to define the dual pseudo-Riemannian metric

$$\eta = \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus \eta_S(k) \quad (2.3)$$

on the  $8N$ -dimensional cotangent space  $T^*M$ .

**Notion of Cartan-Randers Space.** Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a smooth manifold and  $\mathcal{C} \subset T^*\tilde{M}$  a connected open cone of  $TM$ . We introduce the notion of *Cartan space* as a direct generalization from the notion Cartan space as appears in [50],

**Definition 2.1** A Cartan space is a triplet  $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{F}^*, \mathcal{C})$  with  $\widetilde{F}^* : T^*\widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$  smooth on the open cone  $\mathcal{C}$  such that:

- $\widetilde{F}^*$  is homogeneous of degree one on the momentum variables and
- The vertical Hessian (or fundamental tensor  $g$ ) of the function  $(\widetilde{F}^*)^2$  in natural coordinates  $\{(u^i, p_i), i = 1, \dots, 8N\}$

$$g^{ij}(u, p) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 (\widetilde{F}^*(u, p))^2}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 8N. \quad (2.4)$$

is non-degenerate for each  $u \in \widetilde{M}$ .

There is a direct relation between Cartan structures and Hamiltonian systems (see for instance [25, 61] and also *Chapters 5 and 6* in [50]). The fundamental fact in such relation is that the function  $\widetilde{F}^*$  has associated a geodesic and a Hamiltonian flows in  $T\widetilde{M}$  and  $T^*\widetilde{M}$  respectively and that both flows coincide on their projections to  $M$ . The essential requirement to prove this fact is the non-degeneracy condition of the vertical Hessian.

Let us consider a time-like vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$  such that the following condition holds:

$$|\eta^*(\beta, \beta)| < 1. \quad (2.5)$$

$F^*$  is restricted to the open cone  $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow T^*TM$  such that

$$\alpha(u, p) = \sqrt{\eta^{ij}(u) p_i p_j} \quad (2.6)$$

is real, where  $u \in TM$  and  $p \in \mathcal{C}_u TM$ .

Recall that a Randers space is a Finsler space whose Finsler structure is of the form  $F = \alpha(x, y) + \beta(x, y)$ , with  $\alpha(x, y)$  a Riemannian norm and  $\beta(x, y)$  the result of a 1-form acting on a tangent vector  $T_x \widetilde{M}$  [6, 7, 56]. Motivated by this special metrics in Finsler geometry and gravitational models, we define the notion of Cartan-Randers space,

**Definition 2.2** A Cartan-Randers space is a Cartan space whose Cartan function is of the form

$$F^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+, \quad (u, p) \mapsto F^*(u, p) = \alpha(u, p) + \beta(u, p). \quad (2.7)$$

with  $\alpha$  real and  $\beta$  holding the bound condition (2.5).

Elements  $p \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $F^*(u, p) > 0$  are called time-like co-vectors. The boundary  $\partial(\mathcal{C})$  is the *dual light-cone bundle*. Elements  $p \in \partial\mathcal{C}$  are called light-like co-vectors and are characterized by the relation  $F^*(u, p) = 0$ .

A Cartan-Randers structure can be seen as *linearly perturbed* dual Riemannian structure on  $TM$ . The requirement (2.5) implies that the linear perturbation  $\beta(u, p)$  does not introduce a degeneracy in the fundamental tensor (2.4). Note that the linear perturbation is not necessary small, although it is controlled by the condition (2.5). Furthermore, the condition (2.5) also implies that  $F^*$  is positive definite in the open cone  $\mathcal{C}$ . For a fixed point  $u = (x, y) \in TM$ , the  $\beta$ -term is given by the expression

$$\beta(u, p) = \beta^i(u) p_i. \quad (2.8)$$

where  $\{\beta^i(u)\}_{i=1}^{8N}$  are the components of the vector  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$ .  $\beta$  acts on the 1-form  $p \in \mathcal{C} \subset T^*TM$ . Since the boundness condition (2.5) and the restriction to the open cone  $\mathcal{C}$  implies that the Cartan-Randers structure is positive definite and non-degenerate, the function (2.7) defines a Cartan space of *Randers type* on  $TM$ .

The space of Cartan-Randers structures  $\mathcal{F}_{CR}^*(TM)$  on  $TM$  plays a fundamental role in the formulation of DCRS, since there are geometric flows defined on  $\mathcal{F}_{CR}^*(TM)$  of relevance for the dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom. Let us introduce a compact time parameter  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This parameter describes a geometric evolution of the Cartan-Randers structures in  $\mathcal{F}_{CR}^*(TM)$ . The existence of such geometric flow suggests an analogy to the geometric flow in Riemannian geometry. However, we will not require in this paper the details of such geometric flow except by the following two properties:

- There is a 1-parameter family of connected submanifolds  $\{\mathcal{E}_u(r) \hookrightarrow T_u^*TM, u \in TM\}$  that are stable under the geometric flow.
- The evolution of the connected components of the  $r$ -hyperboloid

$$\Sigma_u(r) := \{p \in T^*TM \text{ s.t. } (F^*(u, p))^2 = r^2\}$$

by the geometric flow has as limit the corresponding *fixed point manifold*  $\mathcal{E}_u(r)$  in a finite time  $t = 1$ .

**The  $U_t$  dynamics.** Given the Cartan-Randers space  $(TM, F^*, \mathcal{C})$ , it is possible to define a tensor  $h \in \Gamma T^{(2,0)}(TM)$  by averaging the fundamental tensor components  $g_{ij}(x, y)$  on each open cone  $\mathcal{C}_u$  [26]. The tensor components  $h^{ij}$  are obtained by averaging the metric coefficients  $g^{ij}$  on the open cone  $\mathcal{C}_u$  of  $u \in TM$ ,

$$h^{ij}(u) = \langle g^{ij}(u, p) \rangle := \frac{1}{\int_{\mathcal{C}_u} d\text{vol}_u(p)} \int_{\mathcal{C}_u} d\text{vol}_u(p) g^{ij}(u, p), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 8N, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}_u$  is the set of timelike co-vectors at  $u$  and  $d\text{vol}_u$  is a maximal, non-degenerate volume form on  $\mathcal{C}_u$ . Although the cone  $\mathcal{C}_u$  is not compact, the volume form  $\text{vol}_u(p)$  is chosen such that the integrals in (2.9) are defined. It can be proven that the volume function  $d\text{vol}_u(p)$  is invariant under local isometries of  $F^*$ .

Note that even if  $P \in \mathcal{C}_u$ , it can happens that  $g^{ij}(u, p)P_i P_j \leq 0$ , because the pseudo-Riemannian signature of the fundamental tensor  $g^{ij}(x, p)$ . Therefore, in contrast with the positive case [26], the averaging of a non-degenerate structure does not have a well defined signature and can be degenerate. Thus, it is useful to consider the extended space  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$  of the Cartan-Randers structures *completed* with the corresponding averaged structures,

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM) := \mathcal{F}_{CR}^*(TM) \cup \{h = \langle g \rangle, g \in \mathcal{F}_{CR}^*(TM)\}. \quad (2.10)$$

**Definition 2.3** An  $U_t$  evolution a the geometric evolution of the Cartan-Randers spaces of a generic form given by the expression

$$U_t : \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM) \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM), \quad F^* \mapsto F_t^* = \sqrt{\kappa(g, t) |h| + (1 - \kappa(g, t)) |g|}, \quad (2.11)$$

such that the function  $\kappa : \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \kappa(g, t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} (\kappa(g, t) - 1) = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

**Remark 2.4** Given a Cartan-Randers structure, they could be several natural  $U_t$ -dynamics, that correspond to dual geometric flows on  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$  subjected to the constraints (2.12). The existence of such a flow is shown explicitly by the homotopy of the type . However, the uniqueness of such flow is postulated. Also, let us note that the rang of  $\kappa$  is in the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

The squared norms  $h(p, p)$  and  $g(p, p)$  are defined by

$$h(p, p) = h^{ij}(u) p_i p_j, \quad g(p, p) = g^{ij}(u) p_i p_j = (F^*(u, p))^2.$$

The  $U_t$  evolution is dissipative. Consider the convex hull  $C_{hg} \subset \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$  containing  $g$  and  $h$ ,

$$C_{hg} := \{F^* \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM) \text{ s.t. } g_{F^*} = t_1 g + t_2 h, t_1 + t_2 = 1, t_1, t_2 \geq 0\},$$

where  $g_{F^*}$  is the fundamental tensor of  $F^*$ .

**Proposition 2.5** Every Cartan-Randers structure  $F^*$  in the convex hull  $C_{hg}$  containing  $g$  and  $h$  evolves towards the averaged structure  $h \in \Gamma T^{(2,0)}TM$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} U_t(F^*) = \sqrt{h}, \quad \forall F^* \in C_{hg}. \quad (2.13)$$

**Proof.** First, note that any  $F^* \in C_{hg}$  has the same averaged metric,

$$\langle g_{F^*} \rangle = \langle (t_1 g + t_2 h) \rangle = t_1 h + t_2 h = h.$$

Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} U_t(F^*) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\kappa(g, t) h_{F^*} + (1 - \kappa(g, t)) g_{F^*}} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\kappa(g, t) h + (1 - \kappa(g, t)) g_{F^*}} \\ &= \sqrt{h}. \end{aligned}$$

□



**Remark 2.6** The averaged construction  $h$  was first formulated in the contest of Finsler geometry, where it induces a functor from the Finsler category to the Riemannian category [26]. The analogous to *Proposition 2.5* also holds in the Finsler category.

$U_t$  is a dissipative evolution in  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$ , since  $h$  is the limit of a geometric evolutions for the convex hull  $C_{hg}$ , that usually contains more than an element. Therefore, one can classify the elements of  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$  in equivalence classes, each equivalence class having the same averaged structure.

The parameter  $t$  is interpreted as the time parameter for an *internal evolution* of the system. Therefore, one can define the corresponding *inversion operation*. At the classical level it will be an idempotent operator on  $T^*TM$ . The *time inversion operation*  $T_t$  is defined in local natural coordinates on  $T^*TM$  by the expression

$$T_t : T^*TM \rightarrow T^*TM, \quad (u, p) = (x, y, p_x, p_y) \mapsto (T_t(u), T_t^*(p)) = (x, -y, -p_x, p_y). \quad (2.14)$$

$T_t$  also acts on the space  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$  by the expression  $T_t(F^*(u, p)) := F^*(T_t(u), T_t(p))$ .  $T_t$  and  $U_t$  have associated flows in  $T^*TM$ . Also, note that a Cartan-Randers metric is non-reversible: it happens that

$$F^*(u, p) \neq F^*(T_t(u), -T_t(p))$$

except for a subset of measure zero in  $(u, p) \in T_u^*TM$ . From this relation it follows the intrinsic irreversible character of the Randers geometry [56].

We assume the natural condition that such action commutes with the  $U_t$  evolution,

$$[U_t, T_t] = 0, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.15)$$

This commutation relation guarantees that  $T_t(F^*)$  and  $F^*$  are in the same class of equivalence  $[h]$ , if  $h$  is invariant under  $T_t$ ,

$$T_th = h$$

since equivalence classed are disjoint sets in  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$ . Indeed, one can prove by a continuity argument on the that for  $t = 1$  there is an  $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}$  such that the condition (2.15) holds for each  $\tilde{t} \in (1 - \epsilon, 1]$ . Furthermore, this condition implies the invariance  $T_t(\kappa(g, t)) = \kappa(g, t)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} T_t(h) &= T_t(\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} U_t(F^*)) \\ &= T_t(\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \sqrt{\kappa(g, t)h + (1 - \kappa(g, t))g_{F^*}}) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} T_t(\sqrt{\kappa(g, t)h + (1 - \kappa(g, t))g_{F^*}}) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} (\sqrt{T_t(\kappa(g, t))T_t(h) + T_t(1 - \kappa(g, t))T_t(g_{F^*})}) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} (\sqrt{T_t(\kappa(g, t))h + T_t(1 - \kappa(g, t))g_{F^*}}). \end{aligned}$$

A sufficient condition for the last line coincides with  $h$  is that  $T_t(\kappa(g, t)) = \kappa(g, t)$ . We adopt this condition, justified in the above argument.

It is clear that  $T_t$  is idempotent,

$$(T_t)^2 = Id, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.16)$$

**The  $U_\tau$  evolution.** The kinematics and dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom respect to the external parameter  $\tau$  is described as follow. First, the the speed components  $\beta_x$  and the acceleration components  $\beta_y$  of the vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$  are defined with the aid of the time inversion operator  $T_t$ ,

$$\beta_x := \frac{1}{2}(\beta - T_t(\beta)), \quad \beta_y := \frac{1}{2}(\beta + T_t(\beta)). \quad (2.17)$$

For DCRS spaces, the non-degeneracy of the fundamental tensor  $g$  of the underlying Cartan-Randers space is ensured if the vector field  $\beta$  is bounded by the metric  $\eta^*$ ,  $\|\beta\|_{\eta^*} < 1$ . This implies in particular that all the *components* of  $\beta(x, y)$  are covariantly bounded in the following geometric way,

$$\eta_4(\beta_x, \beta_x) \leq c, \quad \eta_4(\beta_y, \beta_y) \leq a_{max}, \quad i = 0, \dots, 4N. \quad (2.18)$$

The same conditions imply that the function  $F^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is non-degenerate. This property is essential to prove the equivalence between Cartan spaces and Hamiltonian systems, which lies on the basis of our correspondence deterministic systems and DCRS.

The classical *Hamiltonian function* of a DCRS is defined by

$$H(u, p) := F^*(u, p) - F^*(T_t(u), T_t^*(p)) = 2\beta^i(u)p_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8N. \quad (2.19)$$

The Hamiltonian (2.19) corresponds to a *time orientation average* of the Cartan-Randers function associated with a particular form of classical Hamiltonian (see for instance [61], p. 22 or the example 2.7 below). It defines the  $U_\tau$  evolution of the fundamental degrees of freedom. It is the first stage towards the *total averaged Hamiltonian*.

The Hamilton equations for  $H(u, p)$  are

$$\dot{u}^i = \frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial p_i} = 2\beta^i(u), \quad \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial u^i} = -2\frac{\partial \beta^k(u)}{\partial u^i} p_k, \quad i, j, k = 1, \dots, 8N, \quad (2.20)$$

where the time derivatives are taken respect to the non-compact time parameter  $\tau$  (one can check that the equations are reversible respect to  $T_t$ ). If one requires the *on-shell* conditions

$$\{\dot{x}^i = y^i, i = 1, \dots, 4N\}, \quad (2.21)$$

the Hamilton equation must be constrained. Thus the first equations of Hamilton imply

$$\beta_y^k(x, \dot{x}) = \dot{\beta}_x^k(x, \dot{x}).$$

The analogous constraints for the second set of Hamilton's equations are the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_{x^i} &= -2\frac{\partial \beta_x^k(x, y)}{\partial x^i} \Big|_{y=\dot{x}} p_{x^k} - 2\frac{\partial \dot{\beta}_x^k(x, y)}{\partial x^i} \Big|_{y=\dot{x}} p_{y^k}, \\ \dot{p}_{y^i=\dot{x}^i} &= -2\frac{\partial \dot{\beta}_x^k(x, y)}{\partial y^i} \Big|_{y=\dot{x}} p_{x^k} - 2\frac{\partial \ddot{\beta}_x^k(x, y)}{\partial y^i} \Big|_{y=\dot{x}} p_{y^k}. \end{aligned}$$

However, we will not use such constraints in the following considerations.

**Example 2.7** This example shows that the requirement of non-degeneracy of the Cartan-Randers metric leads to a related Hamiltonian formulation of DCRS. Clearly, it should be taken as an heuristic picture. Let us consider an example from J. Synge that relates Cartan-Randers spaces with the averaged of the Hamiltonian function of a relativistic point charged particle (2.19) (see [61], *paragraph 12*). It can be shown that the Hamiltonian constraint

$$\bar{H}(\xi, p(\xi)) = \eta_4^{\mu\nu} (p_\mu + \bar{\beta}_\mu)(p_\nu + \bar{\beta}_\nu) - 1 = 0, \quad (2.22)$$

where  $(\xi, p)$  are conjugated variables and  $\bar{H}(p(\xi), \xi)$  is the Hamiltonian function, has the same Hamilton equations than the Euler-Lagrange equations of the *Finsler-Randers functions*  $f_\pm : TM_4 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  defined by the expression

$$f_\pm(\xi, \dot{\xi}) = \bar{\beta}_\mu \dot{\xi}^\mu \pm \sqrt{\eta_{\mu\nu}^4 \dot{\xi}^\mu \dot{\xi}^\nu}, \quad (2.23)$$

when the solutions are parameterized by the proper time parameter associated with the Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$ . This relation can be found by comparing the Hamilton equations with the geodesic equations of a Randers space (eg. [7], *Chapter 11*).

One can consider the *dual Finsler function* of a Randers functions  $f_\pm^* : T^*M_4 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,

$$f_\pm^*(x, p) = A^\mu p_\mu \pm \sqrt{\eta_4(p, p)}. \quad (2.24)$$

This function is related with the relativistic Hamiltonian function of a point charged particle. In particular, the Hamiltonian function of a point charged particle is of the form  $H = E + V$ , where  $E$  is the kinetic plus rest energy function and  $V$  the potential energy [41]. Then the Hamiltonian (2.19) corresponds to the *averaged in time* of the functions  $f_+$  and  $f_-$ ,

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(f_+^* + f_-^*). \quad (2.25)$$

The Hamiltonian equations (2.20) are the Hamiltonian equations of the fundamental di-atomic molecules whose Hamiltonian function is (2.25).

An important property of the Hamiltonian evolution is that the dynamics  $U_\tau$  is reversible,

**Proposition 2.8** *The  $U_\tau$  evolution is reversible in the sense that,*

$$H(u, p) = H(T_t(u), T_t(p)).$$

**Proof.** It is direct from the definition of  $T_t$  by equation (2.14), the property that  $T_t$  is idempotent and the definition of the beta functions (2.17).  $\square$

**Relation between the parameter  $t$  and the parameter  $\tau$ .** In DCRS the  $t$ -time parameter and the  $\tau$ -time parameter are essentially different. This is one of the most relevant facts about DCRS as framework for models of deterministic quantum mechanics. However, an analogous time inversion operation can be defined respect to the time parameter  $\tau$ . Because of the definition of the  $T_t$  inversion operation (2.14), it turns out that the time parameter  $t$  and the time parameter  $\tau$  flow in *the same direction* and that on any fundamental state the following condition holds,

$$T_t = T_\tau. \quad (2.26)$$

Thus, although  $t$  and  $\tau$  are independent, there is a fundamental relation between  $t$  and  $\tau$ : increasing  $t$  corresponds to increasing  $\tau$  in the dynamics. Furthermore, there is a partial order for events defined as follows,

**Definition 2.9** *An event  $q$  compatible with a DCRS is a point represented in the configuration manifold  $TM$  in the instant  $(t(q), \tau(q))$  such that  $q = \xi(t, \tau)$ .*

Let us consider the relation  $R$  in the set of all events by

$$q \leq \tilde{q} \quad \text{iff} \quad \tau(q) \leq \tau(\tilde{q}) \quad \text{and} \quad t(q) = t(\tilde{q}).$$

**Proposition 2.10** *The relation  $\leq$  in the set of all events  $\mathcal{E}$  compatibles with a DCRS is a partial order.*

**Proof.** The transitive property of the partial order is direct from the analogous property of the real numbers **R**. Also, note that since The reflexive property is direct from the respective reflexive properties of the real numbers.  $\square$

The reversibility property of *Proposition 2.8* is expected, since we have symmetrized the Hamiltonian respect to the time parameter  $t$ , that is equivalent to symmetrize respect to the time parameter  $\tau$ . However, the  $U_t$  is an irreversible dynamics, in contrast with the  $U_\tau$  dynamics.

**Remark 2.11** Besides the formal resemblance, there is a significative difference between the time symmetrized dynamics in DCRS and the two-state vector formalism in quantum mechanics [3, 4, 64, 65]. While in DCRS the symmetrization is respect to the internal time evolution  $U_t$ , that is  $t \in [0, 1]$ , in the two-vector state formalism the symmetrization on time is respect to the external time evolution dynamics, represented by the operator  $U_\tau$ . Both evolution operators are independent, from which follows different interpretations.

The hypothesis that each fundamental molecule is composed by a fundamental atom evolving forward in time  $t$  and another atom evolving backward on time  $t$  is a way to symmetrize the solutions of a dynamical system respect. As we remarked before, there is certainly a similarity of this symmetrization with the symmetrization of the solutions for Maxwell equations in the Wheeler-Feynman electrodynamics [66]. Two main formal differences with Wheeler-Feynman theory is that we are considering a *deeper* level of description, based on the Hamiltonian formalism of point particles instead than a Lagrangian field theory and that the fundamental dynamics being symmetrized is non-reversible. Furthermore, the DCRS formalism does not applies directly to the Standard Model degrees of freedom.

**Information loss dynamics and some consequences: the Principle of Inertia and diffeomorphism invariance.** If  $(TM, F^*, \mathcal{C})$  is a Cartan-Randers space that evolves to the final *averaged structure*  $(TM, h)$  by the  $U_t$  operation, for each value of  $t$  there is an element  $(TM, F_t^*)$  of  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{CR}^*(TM)$ . Applying the time inversion

operation  $T_t$  to  $F_t^*$  and taking into account that the function  $\kappa(g, t)$  is invariant under  $T_t$ , one obtains the corresponding Hamiltonian of a DCRS at the instant  $(t, \tau)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_t(u, p) &= F_t^*(u, p) - F_t^*(T_t(u), T_t^*(p)) \\
&= (1 - \kappa(g, t))\sqrt{g^{ij}(u, p)p_i p_j} + \kappa(g, t)\sqrt{\langle g^{ij} \rangle p_i p_j} \\
&\quad - (1 - \kappa(g, t))\sqrt{g^{ij}(T_t(u), T_t^*(p))p_i p_j} - \kappa(g, t)\sqrt{\langle g^{ij} \rangle p_i p_j} \\
&= (1 - \kappa(g, t))\sqrt{g^{ij}(u, p)p_i p_j} - (1 - \kappa(g, t))\sqrt{g^{ij}(T_t(u), T_t^*(p))p_i p_j} \\
&= (1 - \kappa(g, t))\beta^k(u)p_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the Hamiltonian at the instant  $(t, \tau)$  of a DCRS is

$$H_t(u, p) = (1 - \kappa(g, t))\beta^k(u)p_k. \quad (2.27)$$

Then by the limit conditions (2.12), the *equilibrium Hamiltonian* (or completely averaged Hamiltonian) of a DCRS is identically zero,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} H_t(u, p) = 0. \quad (2.28)$$

Motivated by the fact that the systems are ergodic and also, reach an equilibrium state in a finite time, it is natural to assume that there two different *phases* in the  $U_t$  dynamics. The first corresponds to the *ergodic phase*, where the system is still far from reaching the equilibrium state. This corresponds to a phenomenological description in terms of *quantum states* and is non-local in the space-time  $M_4$ : the physical system is spread in space-time. In this phase the dynamics of the quantum state is driven by  $H_t$  and the Hamiltonian equations (2.20). After this phase, which is assumed a fast phase, a transition is produce to a dissipative dynamics, converging to equilibrium states as indicated in the condition (2.28).

The equilibrium condition (2.28) can be interpreted in a weaker form as a constraint on the Hamiltonian (2.19) on *equilibrium states*. For this, we need to consider a vector space, associated with the space of Cartan-Randers systems. The vector space  $\mathcal{V}$  is defined operationally from the *space-time operator algebra*. A general algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  which hold representations of the Lorentz group is generated by  $\{\hat{X}^a, a = 1, \dots, m\}$  and can be written generically as

$$[\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^b] := C^{ab}{}_d \hat{X}^d + C^{ab} \mathbf{1}, \quad a, b, c, d = 0, \dots, 7. \quad (2.29)$$

where  $C^{ab}{}_d$  and  $C^{ab}$  are tensors such that (2.29) hold a general representation of the Lorentz group and there is an enveloping algebra  $(\mathcal{A}, \circ)$  with unity  $\mathbf{1}$ . Note that this relations also encompasses the velocity directions in  $TM$ . There are two natural possibilities for an algebra which is Lorentz co-variant:

- Snyder space-time [60] as the spectrum of an algebra representation of the isometries of an (anti-)de Sitter space 5-dimensional space,
- The commutative space-time algebra  $[\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^b] = 0, a, b = 0, \dots, 7$ .

Since Snyder's model of quantum space-time contains a minimal length and is Lorentz invariant, a covariant (respect to the Lorentz) maximal acceleration appears in Snyder's framework<sup>3</sup>. However, we will consider here the commutative case, leaving for a companion work to analyze the relation of maximal acceleration and non-commutative quantum space-times.

The coordinate functions of the space-time points are defined as the eigenvalues of the algebra of commuting operators. In order to define the vector space associated with a DCRS, it is necessary to consider the product representation of the algebra  $[\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^b] = 0$ ,

$$[\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{x}_j^\nu] = 0, \quad [\hat{y}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_j^\nu] = 0, \quad [\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_j^\nu] = 0 \quad k, j = 1, \dots, N, \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.30)$$

Then a generator set of the vector space  $\mathcal{V}$  is defined as the set of eigenvectors of the operators  $\{X^\mu, Y^\mu \mid \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3\}$ ,

$$\hat{x}_k^\mu |\psi\rangle = x_k^\mu |\psi\rangle, \quad \hat{y}_k^\mu |\psi\rangle = y_k^\mu |\psi\rangle, \quad k = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.31)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>This is also true for other quantum spaces such Majid-Ruegg quantum space-time [45], that also contain a minimal length and a variable maximal speed.

We will consider the canonical quantization condition

$$[\hat{u}_i^a, \hat{p}_b^j] = \delta_i^j \delta_b^a \mathbf{1}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, N, \quad a, b = 0, \dots, 7. \quad (2.32)$$

These relations do not prevent to have a well defined trajectory for the fundamental degrees of freedom, since the quantization is on the tangent space  $TM$ , instead of  $M$ . Therefore, states have position and speed well defined, and as consequence the classical trajectories of the fundamental degrees of freedom are well defined on the configuration manifold  $M$ .

The *symmetric quantization* of the Hamiltonian (2.27) gives the operator

$$\hat{H}_t(u, p) := \frac{1}{2} (1 - \kappa(g, t)) (\beta^i(\hat{u}) \hat{p}_i + \hat{p}_i \beta^i(\hat{u})), \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad i = 1, \dots, 8N.$$

$\hat{H}_t(u, p)$  is univocally defined, Hermitian and is determined by elements from the classical version of a DCRS. The corresponding Schrödinger equation is

$$\imath \hbar \frac{d}{d\tau} |\psi\rangle = \hat{H}_t(u, p) |\psi\rangle, \quad |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (2.33)$$

**Example 2.12** In order to define an Hermitian operator, we consider the hypothesis that the operators  $\{\hat{\beta}^i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$  are of the form

$$\hat{\beta}^i(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) = a^i(\tau) \hat{x}^i + \hat{\beta}_{red}^i(\hat{u}^1, \dots, \hat{x}^{i-1}, \hat{u}^{i+1}, \dots, \hat{u}^{8N}), \quad i = 1, \dots, 8N. \quad (2.34)$$

The *reduced*  $\beta$ -operators  $\beta^i$  depends on the operator  $\beta^i$  in a linear term. In this dynamical system the  $i$ -degree of freedom does not interact with itself.

The *states* corresponding to the equilibrium states are zero modes of the Hamiltonian,

$$\left( \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \hat{H}_t(u, p) \right) |\psi\rangle_0 = 0, \quad |\psi\rangle_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0. \quad (2.35)$$

After some algebra, one can see that the solutions of corresponding Heisenberg equations are exponential operators on  $\tau$ . Therefore, this model has the same mathematical properties than a multidimensional version of the Berry-Connes-Keating Hamiltonian [8, 17], which is well known related with the Polya-Hilbert conjecture on the Riemann hypothesis.

The  $U_t$  evolution provides a finite effective Hamiltonian acting on observable states. Furthermore, the action of the Hamiltonian on equilibrium states is invariant under diffeomorphism transformations, since the effective Hamiltonian acting on an equilibrium state is zero and the formalism is Lorentz invariant from the beginning. This property of diffeomorphism invariance applies to the evolution from equilibrium state to equilibrium state, since for any equilibrium state the constraint (2.28). To clarify the meaning of the diffeomorphism invariance, let us consider the averaged of the Hamiltonian  $\langle \hat{H}_t \rangle$  from the Hamiltonian (2.27) given by the formula

$$\langle \hat{H}_t \rangle |\psi\rangle := \int_{\mathcal{C}_u} d\text{vol}_u(p') \frac{\int_{\mathcal{C}_u} d\text{vol}_u(p) \langle p' | \hat{H}_t | \psi \rangle |p'\rangle}{\int_{\mathcal{C}_u} d\text{vol}_u(p)}, \quad |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.36)$$

Let us introduce the  $U_\tau$  quantum evolution operator by the expression

$$U_{\tau_0}^\tau |\psi\rangle(\tau_0) := |\psi\rangle(\tau_0) - \imath \delta\tau \hat{H} |\psi\rangle(\tau_0), \quad \delta\tau = \tau - \tau_0. \quad (2.37)$$

Therefore, it follows from the definition of the classical Hamiltonian as generator of the evolution of the system that the unitary operator  $U_{\tau_0}^\tau$  is such that

$$U_{\tau_0}^\tau |\psi\rangle(\tau_0) = |\psi\rangle(\tau).$$

Once a DCRS reaches an equilibrium state, since the state  $|\psi\rangle$  is a zero mode of  $\hat{H}$ , the system remains in the equilibrium state or changes to another equilibrium state, if no exterior perturbations acts on the system. That the state can change from equilibrium to equilibrium depends on the coordinate system and is a compatibility Lorentz invariant condition. This is a form of stating the following *Principle of Inertia*,

**Proposition 2.13** *For each DCRS in an equilibrium state that is not perturbed by an external agent, there is a coordinate system such that the DCRS remains in the same equilibrium state.*

**Remark 2.14** If the equilibrium is characterized by states with coordinates  $(x, y, p_x, p_y)$  such that

$$x_i = x_{i+4k}, y - i = y_{i+4k}, \dots, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then *Proposition 2.13* implies the Principle of Inertia of Classical Mechanics.

The *natural tendency* towards the equilibrium state and its persistence can be understood by a probabilistic argument. It is convenient to assume that the ergodic hypothesis holds in DCRS and that the phase averaging operation  $\langle \cdot \rangle_{C_u}$  is equivalent to the time averaging operation along the time  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, a system described by a DCRS model evolves on the  $t$ -time towards the zero average Hamiltonian by the condition (2.35) and the system expends *more time* near the zero modes of  $H$  than in other modes. Following this interpretation, the equilibrium point state is *reached* faster for systems composed by a large number of indistinguishable particles. This is because the phase averaged state is reached easier for systems with a large number of degrees of freedom, since for such systems it will be more frequent to pass through each of the possible states than for a smaller system (all the fundamental degrees of freedom are undistinguishable for a macroscopic observer). The same consequence is true for macroscopic systems, when defined through the averaged center of mass variables.

In DCRS gravitational interaction is not the source of dissipation of information, in contrast with other schemes of dissipative fundamental dynamics [35, 55, 58]. Instead, in DCRS there is a quantum measurement mechanism that uses asymptotic geometric-analytic arguments only (that are a generalization of the above probabilistic argument, that correspond to *asymptotic Banach theory* in Functional Analysis and to some aspects of measure metric spaces in Geometry). As we will see in the next *section*, in DCRS framework there is an emergent interpretation of the Weak Equivalence Principle. Also, we have seen in this *section* that diffeomorphism invariance can be argued to be an emergent phenomena as well. Therefore, it is reasonable to think that gravity is an emergent phenomena in DCRS. If this is the case, gravitational interaction cannot be the source of information loss at the Planck scale by itself, although it is an ingredient in the quantum measurement process, as we will see in the next *section*.

### 3 The isometry group of a DCRS

Given a DCRS specified by a tensor  $\eta \in \Gamma T^{(2,0)}TM$  and a vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$ , an isometry of  $F^* = \alpha + \beta$  is a linear diffeomorphism  $\phi : TM \rightarrow TM$  that preserves the Cartan-Randers function  $F^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow M$ ,

$$F^*(\phi(u), \phi^*(p)) = F^*(u, p), \quad \forall (u, p) \in \mathcal{C}.$$

The isometry group of a pseudo-Finsler structure is a linear Lie group [29]. The isometry transformation  $\phi$  must leave invariant each of the terms  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  independently. This is a direct consequence of the algebraic relations,

$$\alpha(u, p) = \frac{1}{2}(F^*(u, p) + F^*(u, -p)), \quad \beta(u, p) = \frac{1}{2}(F^*(u, p) - F^*(u, -p)), \quad \forall p \in T_u^*TM, u \in TM.$$

Thus for the isometry  $\phi : TM \rightarrow TM$ , the following relation hold:

$$\sqrt{\eta^{ij}(u)p_i p_j} = \sqrt{\eta^{ij}(\phi(u))(\phi^*p)_i (\phi^*p)_j}, \quad \beta^i p_i = \beta^i(\phi(u))(\phi^*p)_i.$$

Therefore, the isometry  $\phi$  must left invariant the metric  $\eta$  when acting on time-like co-vectors. Since the action of isometry  $\phi$  is linear in its action on co-vectors, the above condition is translated to arbitrary co-vectors.

The metric  $\eta$  has the structure of a product of metrics

$$\eta = \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus \eta_S(k)$$

and therefore, it can be seen as a *gauge field* that associates to each degree of freedom  $\{k = 1, \dots, N\}$  a copy of the Sasaki metric  $\eta_S(k)$  on each  $TM_4^k$ .

In general, the isometry group of the metric  $\eta$  is not the direct sum of the isometry groups  $Iso(\eta_S(k))$ . However, because we make the assumption that the embeddings  $\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4$  are isometries and we identify  $\varphi(\xi)$  with  $\xi$  as a point in the model manifold  $M_4$ , it is natural to consider the *diagonal isometry group*  $Iso(\eta)_d \subset Iso(\eta)$ , composed by the isometries of the form

$$Iso(\eta)_d := \{(1, \dots, 1, \theta(k), 1, \dots, 1), \theta(k) \in Iso(\eta_S(k)), k = 1, \dots, N\} \quad (3.1)$$

and with 1 the unit element of the isometry group  $Iso_S(\eta)$ . This condition is consistent with the *locality condition* in the assumption A.4. Thus the diagonal isometries of  $\eta$  are determined by the *isometries*  $\phi(k)$  for each metric  $\eta_S(k)$ . Therefore,

$$Iso(\eta)_d = \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus Iso(\eta_S(k)). \quad (3.2)$$

Since each of the Sasaki type metrics has isometry group isomorphic to

$$Iso(\eta_S(k)) \cong G \times G$$

for some given Lie group  $G = Iso(F^*)$  (see for instance [29]), the *isometry group*  $Iso(\eta)_d$  must be of the form

$$Iso(\eta)_d \cong \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus Iso(\eta_S(k)) \cong \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus G \times G.$$

The Lie group  $G$  is a subgroup of the Lorentz group  $O(1, 3)$ . This is because the isometries of  $\eta_4$  are a closed subgroup of the isometries of the Minkowski metric. Therefore, the *gauge group*  $G(k) \times G(k)$  is contained in the group  $O(1, 3) \times O(1, 3)$ ,

$$G(k) \times G(k) \subset (O(1, 3) \times O(1, 3))|_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

As a consequence, one has the relations

$$Iso(\eta)_d \cong \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus Iso(\eta_S(k)) \subset \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus (O(1, 3) \times O(1, 3))|_k. \quad (3.3)$$

Furthermore, the *phases*  $\theta(k) \in (O(1, 3) \times O(1, 3))_k$  are defined independently for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

On the other hand, the isometries of  $F^*$  leave invariant the vector  $\beta(u) \in T_u TM$ . In a similar way as before, we note that the vector field  $\beta$  is decomposed as

$$\beta = \sum_{k=1}^N \beta(k) = \sum_{k=1}^N \oplus (\beta_x(k) \oplus \beta_y(k)), \quad (3.4)$$

which shows the independence on the evolution equations for the  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates. The action of the isometry group is determined by the actions

$$\theta_k : (G \times G)_k \times T_{(x,y)} TM \rightarrow T_{(x,y)} TM, \quad ((\theta_x, \theta_y), (\beta_x, \beta_y)) \mapsto (\theta_x \cdot \beta_x, \theta_y \cdot \beta_y), \quad (3.5)$$

where the actions  $\theta_x \cdot \beta_x$  and  $\theta_y \cdot \beta_y$  are the standard vector representations of the group  $G$  on each  $T_{(x,y)} TM$ .

Since in our model the metric  $\eta_4$  is a background metric, let us assume for simplicity that  $\eta_4$  is the Minkowski metric. Then it holds the relation  $G \cong O(1, 3)$ .

The invariance of the vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$  under isometries is equivalent to the invariance of each 2-jet  $(\beta_x(k), \beta_y(k)) \in J_0^2(\xi(k))$  for the fundamental degrees of freedom labeled by  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . This indeed, has only general geometric meaning if one introduce a covariant derivative to make  $\beta_y(k)$  covariant, for each  $k$ . This can be done by introducing the Levi-Civita connections. Then one understand the four acceleration  $\beta_y(k) \cong \dot{\xi}(k) \in J_0^2(\xi(k))$  as a covariant acceleration.

Let us consider the local symmetries of the DCRS. There are two options, depending on the degrees of freedom are time-like or light-like. As we assume that the metric  $\eta_4$  is the Minkowski metric we have

- The four vectors  $\{\beta_x(k) \cong \dot{\xi} \in T_x M_4^k, \quad k = 1, \dots, N\}$  are assumed to be time-like and the four acceleration  $\beta_y(k) \cong \ddot{\xi} \in J_0^2(\xi)$  is space-like, for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Then the isotropy sub-group of  $O(1, 3) \times O(1, 3)$  leaving invariant the timelike vector velocity and the spacelike vector acceleration  $\beta_t = (\beta_x(k), \beta_y(k)) = (\dot{\xi}, \ddot{\xi})$  is

$$(U(1) \times SO(3))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y. \quad (3.6)$$

- The four vectors  $\{\beta_x(k) \cong \dot{\xi} \in T_x M_4^k, \quad k = 1, \dots, N\}$  are of light-like and the four acceleration is assumed to be space-like. In this case, the isotropy group leaving invariant the representative vector  $\beta_t = (1, 0, 0, -1) \oplus (0, 0, 0, 1)$  is

$$Iso(\xi_t) = (SO(1, 1) \times U(1))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y. \quad (3.7)$$

Let us mention that we demand that the four acceleration  $\beta_y$  must be imposed to be a spatial 4-vector. This is because a priori, the on-shell conditions (2.21).

## 4 Construction of local quantum phases and transition to continuous description

One can define local phases defined on  $M_4$  associated with a DCRS. To show this we need to pass from a denumerable collection of submanifolds

$$\{\xi(k) : [0, 1] \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow M_4^k, k = 1, \dots, N\}$$

to a continuous description in the manifold  $M_4$ . First, we fix a given value of the parameter  $\tau$ . This can be done locally in  $M_4$ , but for our purposes, we assume that it can also be done globally (that is,  $M_4$  is a foliated as  $M_4^k \simeq \mathbf{R} \times M_3^k$ ).

Let us define a *canonical distance function* on  $M_4$  (note that  $M_4$  is endowed with a background Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$ ). Given a time-like vector field  $W \in \Gamma TM_4$ , there is associated a Riemannian metric on  $M_4$ , defined by the expression

$$\bar{\eta}_4(U, V) = -\eta_4(U, V) + 2 \frac{\eta_4(U, W)\eta_4(V, W)}{\eta_4(W, W)}, \quad U, V \in \Gamma TM. \quad (4.1)$$

The distance function  $d_V : M_4 \times M_4 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is the associated with the Riemannian distance function.

Since there are the embeddings  $\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4$ , each manifold  $M_4^k$  is diffeomorphic to the model manifold  $M_4$ , then one has the corresponding embeddings  $\hat{\xi}(k) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \times M_3$ , for each fixed value of  $\tau$ . Furthermore, the manifolds  $M_4^k$  and  $M_4$  are endowed with Lorentzian metrics that are isometric to the Minkowski metric for each value of  $k$ . Therefore, we can assume that each  $\psi_k$  is an isometric embedding and consider the induced embeddings of the world lines of the *molecules*  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  from  $M_4^k$  in  $M_4$ ,  $\varphi_k(\xi_k) = \hat{\xi}_k \hookrightarrow M_4$ . In this way, the embeddings are of the form  $\xi(k) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \times M_3^k$ ,  $t \mapsto (t, \vec{\xi}(k))$ , for each fixed value of the parameter  $\tau$ .

Assuming the validity of the axiom of choice, the following function can be defined: given  $x \in M_4$  and  $\xi(k)$ , the *distance function* between  $x$  and  $\hat{\xi}(k)$  is given by

$$d_4(x, \hat{\xi}(k)) := \sup \left\{ \inf \{d_V(x, \tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \in \hat{\xi}(k)\}, V \in \Gamma TM, \text{time-like and unitary} \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

This distance function does not depend on  $\tau \in \mathbf{R}$ . Therefore, we consider this distance function defined for the original embeddings

$$\xi(k) : [0, 1] \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow M_4. \quad (4.3)$$

Since the embedding functions  $\{\varphi_k, k = 1, \dots, N\}$  are fixed, we will denote by  $\xi(k)$  the embedded submanifolds  $\hat{\xi}(k)$ , in order to simplify the notation. Then we can consider  $d_4(x, \xi(\bar{k})) = \min\{d_4(x, \xi(k)), k = 1, \dots, N\}$ . Let us assume that such distance is realized for the molecule denoted by the integer  $\bar{k}$ . Then at the point  $x \in M_4$  we can choose the corresponding *local phase* as the one associated with a particular isometry  $\theta(\bar{k}) \in U(1) \times U(1)$  leaving invariant the 1-jet and 2-jet  $(\beta_x(t(\bar{k})), \beta_y(t(\bar{k})))$ .

Let us consider

$$\|Z\|_{\eta_4} := \eta_4(Z, Z)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for  $Z \in \Gamma TM$  timelike and  $D$  be the Levi-Civita connection of  $\eta_4$ . Given a curve  $z : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow M_4$ , one can consider an adapted covariant frame  $\{\dot{z}, D_{\dot{z}}\dot{z}, D_{\dot{z}}^2\dot{z}, D_{\dot{z}}^3\dot{z}\}$  along  $z$ , where  $D_{\dot{z}}^1\dot{z} := \dot{z}$ ,  $D_{\dot{z}}^2\dot{z} = D_{\dot{z}}D_{\dot{z}}\dot{z}$ , etc... Then we consider the following definition for the phases,

**Definition 4.1** Let  $V \in \Gamma TM$  be a non-zero, timelike, unitary vector  $\eta_4(V, V) = 1$ , then

$$\cosh(\theta_n)(x, V) := \eta_4(V, D_{\xi(\bar{k})}^n \dot{\xi}(\bar{k})) \frac{1}{\|D_{\xi(\bar{k})}^n \dot{\xi}(\bar{k})\|_{\eta_4}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\dot{\xi}(\bar{k})$ ,  $D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi}(\bar{k})$ , etc... and  $V$  are evaluated at the point  $\xi(\bar{k})$  where the function  $\{d_V(x, \xi(k)), k = 1, \dots, N\}$  is minimized.

In this definition it is required that  $D_{\dot{\xi}}^n \dot{\xi} \neq 0$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 3$ . If  $D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi} = 0$ , then the second local phase is defined identically zero,  $\theta_2 = 0$ . Also, note that in order to be consistent, the covariant acceleration  $D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi}$  and the speed velocity vector  $\dot{\xi}$  must be bounded in  $\eta_4$ . That  $D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi}$  must be bounded in the Definition 4.1 is because if the acceleration were not bounded, it will be situations where  $\theta_2 = 0$  is a limit point for any  $V \in \Sigma$ . However, this



is a n un-physical situation (since a global phase is not a measurable quantity). The existence of a maximal speed follows from the fact that the theory is Lorentz invariant<sup>4</sup>. Similarly for other phases

The local phases  $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4\}$  depend on the choice of the vector field  $V$ , that apart from being time-like and unitary, is otherwise arbitrary. Different choices of  $V$  imply different choices of local phases (4.4) at each point  $x \in M_4$ . Furthermore, for each  $V$  time-like and unitary,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\cosh(\theta_1)) &= \frac{d}{dt}(\eta_4(V, \dot{\xi}) \frac{1}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}}) \\ &= (\eta_4(D_{\dot{\xi}}V, \dot{\xi}) + \eta_4(V, D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi})) \frac{1}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}} + \eta_4(V, \dot{\xi}) \frac{d}{dt}(\frac{1}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}}) \\ &= \eta_4(D_{\dot{\xi}}V, \dot{\xi}) \frac{1}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}} + \frac{\|D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}} \cosh(\theta_2) + \|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4} \frac{d}{dt}(\frac{1}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}}) \cosh(\theta_1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one finds the relation

$$\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4} \frac{d}{dt}(\cosh(\theta_1)) - \frac{\|D_{\dot{\xi}}\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}}{\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}} \cosh(\theta_2) - \frac{d}{dt}(\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\eta_4}) \cosh(\theta_1) = \eta_4(D_{\dot{\xi}}V, \dot{\xi}). \quad (4.5)$$

As a consequence, there is no local relation between  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  which is independent of the vector field  $D_{\dot{\xi}}V$ . Similarly, one can argue that all the four phases  $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4\}$  are independent for a generic point in space-time. Also, the physical properties of a DCRS should be independent of the choice of  $V$ . This implies the requirement of *gauge invariance* induced by the selection of  $V$  in the determination of the phases  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . Furthermore, note that the local phases  $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4\} \subset [0, 2\pi)$  vary as  $V$  varies in the unitary hyperboloid bundle  $\Sigma := \{(x, y) \in TM_4, s.t. \eta_4(y, y) = 1\}$ .

The case when the fundamental degrees of freedom are light-like also deserves attention. In this case, a suitable limit for the phases (4.1) should be considered. One way is to consider a sequence of time-like vectors that are accelerated to reach the speed of light. Then there is a transition time-like to light-like degrees of freedom. However, this procedure will not define uniquely the final light-like state. A more suitable procedure is to consider first the light-like degree of freedom and then *regularize* by mean of a convergent series of time-like vectors. In this case, the final light-like degree of freedom is well defined and one has to check that also the phases (4.1) are well defined. This can be achieve if all the time-like degrees of freedom approaching the final light-like degree of freedom have the same product respect to  $V$ .

**The bundle associated with local quantum phases.** One can consider the relation in  $M_4$  given by

$$x_1 \sim x_2 \text{ iff } [k_1] = [k_2], \quad (4.6)$$

where  $[k_i]$  is the natural number in  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  such that  $\xi[k_i]$  is nearest to  $x_i \in M_4$  as defined by using the distance function (4.2). This relation is not an equivalence relation, since different classes can intersect in a non-trivial way as sub-sets of  $M_4$ , avoiding the possibility to define uniquely the phases  $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$  at each point of the space-time. However, if we delete from  $M_4$  such intersections, which are necessarily not dense in  $M_4$  with the standard topology of  $M_4$  as manifold, we obtain the set  $\widetilde{M}_4 \subset M_4$ , where  $\sim$  defines an equivalence relation.

Let us consider  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the collection of equivalence classes  $\{[k], k = 1, \dots, N\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}$  defines a topological basis for a  $\widetilde{M}_4$ . We call this topology *the quantum topology* and each element  $\mathcal{O}$  of the above basis for the topology is a *fundamental cylinder*. With such topology,  $\widetilde{M}_4$  is not Hausdorff and not metrizable (this is not in contradiction to consider the distance  $d_{\eta_4} : \widetilde{M}_4 \times \widetilde{M}_4 \rightarrow R^+$  with the standard topology). Moreover, the quantum topology does not depend on any particular time-like unitary vector field  $V$ . Also, given a world-line  $\xi : I \rightarrow M_4$ , a *dual cylinder* centered at  $\xi$  is the minimal cylinder containing the world-line  $\xi$  and the neighborhood fundamental cylinders that complete surround  $\xi$ .

Let us consider the product

$$P = \widetilde{M}_4 \times U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1).$$

$P$  is topologized with the product topology. Also, let us denote  $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1) = U^4(1)$ . Then we have the following,

**Proposition 4.2** *Let  $P$  and  $\widetilde{M}_4$  be as before with the corresponding topologies. Then the canonical projection  $\pi_P : P \rightarrow \widetilde{M}_4$  is continuous and onto.*

---

<sup>4</sup>A convenient geometric framework for kinematical constraints of maximal acceleration and speed can be found in [28].

Therefore,  $(P, \widetilde{M}_4, U^4(1), \pi_P)$  is a trivial fibre bundle with the above topologies such that

- The fibers  $\pi_P^{-1}(\xi)$  are homomorphic to the abelian group  $U^4(1)$ ,
- The base space is the four manifold  $\widetilde{M}_4$ .

A section is a continuous map  $s : \widetilde{M}_4 \rightarrow P$  such that  $\pi_P \circ s = Id$ . Continuous maps are constant on each open set of the basis topology  $\mathcal{B}$ .

There is an action of the Lorentz group  $O(1, 3)$  on  $P$  as follows. To each Lorentz transformation  $O \in O(1, 3)$ , the action is defined by the relation

$$\rho : P \times O(1, 3) \rightarrow P, \quad (x, \theta_n, O) \mapsto (x, \rho_O(\theta_n)), \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad (4.7)$$

such that if  $\theta_n$  are determined by the unitary time-like vector field  $V$ , then the phases  $\rho_O(\theta_n)$  are determined by the vector field  $O^{-1}(V) \in \Sigma$ . This action is a right, smooth action of  $O(1, 3)$  on  $P$ .

Therefore, in DCRS the degrees of freedom are discrete and there is induced a natural *discretization* in the space-time manifold  $M_4$  in terms of fundamental cylinders. However, for technical purposes, it is convenient to consider a continuous set of degrees of freedom and a space-time to be a manifold. The transition from discrete to continuous degrees of freedom is seen as an approximation in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in the cardinality of fundamental cylinders but also in the natural diameter of the cylinders. In order to use a continuous description as an approximation to a discrete description, we need a mechanism to ponder how many curves  $\hat{\xi}$  are nearby a given point  $x \in M$ . This will led us to a definition of phase density in the next *section*.

## 5 Born's rule as a consequence of the concentration of measure phenomena.

If one imposes enough regularity for the sections  $s \in \Gamma P$  (for instance, that the sections are Lipschitz functions), a natural notion of *probability density* emerges as follows. Consider a point  $x \in M_4$ . If the point is isolated in the sense that, after the embedding (4.3), there are few embeddings  $\hat{\xi}$  near  $x$ , the local phases  $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4\}$  defined at  $x$  could be arbitrary and then there is not an *accumulation of phase*. For such situation we can say that the phase density is zero or very small at the point  $x$ . For points  $x \in M_4$  surrounded by a large number of embedded molecules, the regularity conditions on the dynamics makes necessary a large degree of coherence in the choice of the phases at each of the points. This is because for enough regularity in the internal dynamical law and if the system is composed by a large number  $N$  of molecules, one expects that the phase around  $x$  must be constant, due to the *concentration measure phenomena* [31, 34, 42, 62]. The concentration measure phenomena is a general property of large dimensional with a metric and measure structures that can be stated generally as follows,

*In a metric measure space, real Lipschitz functions of many variables are almost constant almost everywhere.*

The precise meaning of *almost constant* and *almost everywhere* make use of the metric and measure properties of the space. This principle is usually presented as a generalization of the *isoperimetric inequality* in spheres [43] or as a generalization of the *Central Limit Theorem* in probability theory.

**Example 5.1** In a general measure metric space  $(M, \mu, d)$ , the concentration function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  (for a Lipschitz function) is defined as the minimal number such that

$$Prob(|f - M_f| > t) \leq 2 \alpha(P, t), \quad (5.1)$$

This expression implies that the probability that the function  $f$  differs from the median  $M_f$  for more than the given value  $t$ , using the measure of probability  $\mu$ , is bounded by the concentration function  $\alpha(P, t)$ . A typical example of concentration of measure is provided by the concentration of measure in spheres  $\mathbf{S}^N \subset \mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ . For spheres, the concentration function is of the form

$$\alpha(P_N, t) \leq c \exp \left( - \frac{(N-1)}{2} t^2 \right). \quad (5.2)$$

It turns out, that for Lipschitz functions on space of dimension  $N$ , there are similar Chernov's type bounds. This generic feature, that is a consequence of the regularity conditions is useful when one is dealing with higher order dimensions.

We will apply the concentration of measure to the space-time average of the local phases  $(\theta_1(x), \theta_2(x))$ , where the time-like vector field  $V$  has been fixed. Such averages depend on  $N(x)$ -variables with  $N(x)$  a large natural number. For each point  $x \in M_4$  it will be an average<sup>5</sup>. The natural number  $N(x)$  is associated with the fundamental cylinders geometrically surrounding the fundamental cylinder containing  $x$ . In concordance with assumption A.4, only the collection of dual cylinders surrounding  $x$  are involved in the dynamics of the system at  $x$ . This includes any possible measurement at the point  $x$ .

One can define the following *pre-density function*,

$$D_n(r, x) := \frac{\int_{B_r(x)} d\mu \exp(i\theta_n(k))}{\text{vol}_{\bar{\eta}_4}(B_r(x))}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (5.3)$$

In this average operation there are several independent geometric objects: the two measures  $d\mu_0$  and  $d\mu$  in  $M_4$ , a distance function that we use to define the ball  $B_r(x)$  and the local phases  $\{\theta_n(k)\}$ . The measure  $d\mu$  is obtained from the Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$ . To define the open ball

$$B_r(x) := \{z \in M_4, \text{ s.t. } d_4(x, z) < r\}$$

we need a distance function, that we can obtain from the Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$ , if an *external time orientation*  $\mathcal{T} \in \Gamma TM_4$  is considered via the formula (4.1). There are two reasons to assume a time orientation. First, locally on  $M_4$ , there exists always a time orientation and the operations below are local. Second, if the background space-time is Minkowski space-time, the time orientation is globally defined. Therefore, let us assume the existence of  $\mathcal{T}$ . The integral operation and measure are defined as follows. For the measure  $d\mu$ , we have that

$$\text{vol}_{\bar{\eta}_4}(B_r(x)) := \int_{B_r(x)} d\text{vol}_{\bar{\mu}_4}, \quad (5.4)$$

where the volume form  $d\text{vol}_{\bar{\mu}_4}$  is associated to the metric  $\bar{\eta}_4$ . For the integral of the local phase, we consider the following definition:

$$\int_{B_r(x)} d\mu \exp(i\theta_n(k)) := \sum_{\xi(k) \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \text{vol}_{\bar{\eta}_4}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k) \cap B_r(x)) \exp(i\theta_n(k)), \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (5.5)$$

where the cylinder  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k(x))$  is the *dual cylinder* containing  $\xi(k(x))$  and

$$\text{vol}_{\bar{\eta}_4}(\mathcal{O}(k) \cap B_r(x)) = \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k) \cap B_r(x)} d\text{vol}_{\bar{\mu}_4}.$$

By this procedure, one can associate to a DCRS four fundamental density distribution functions

$$|\psi_n|^2 : M_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad x \mapsto \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} |D(r, x)|^2, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (5.6)$$

The physical fundamental densities are obtained by normalizing to one,

$$\int_{M_4} d\text{vol}_{\bar{\eta}_4} \left( \sum_{i=1}^4 |\psi_i|^2 \right) = 1.$$

The set of four densities of phase  $(|\psi_1|^2, |\psi_2|^2, |\psi_3|^2, |\psi_4|^2)$  is our proposed notion of *fundamental density of phase* or *fundamental probability density function*.

For the application of the principle of concentration of measures to the functions (5.6), we need to show that they are Lipschitz functions. Then as a consequence of the concentration phenomena when applied to the density of phase function, the value of the spatial average of the phase functions  $\theta_n$  in a region with a large number of molecules is much larger compared with the case of an isolated molecule<sup>6</sup>. The concentration phenomena will be more effective for large  $N(x)$ , depending on  $x$  as discussed before. We will discuss later when the fundamental density of phase functions can be considered Lipschitz.

Let us consider only the first component  $|\psi_1|^2$  related with the local phase  $\theta_1$  (for the two dimensional spaces, the treatment is completely analogous). Then the *fundamental states* are of the form

$$\psi_1(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} D(r, x) \exp(i\theta_1(k(x))). \quad (5.7)$$

<sup>5</sup>The assumption of a discrete space-time is fundamental here. Indeed, one can apply concentration of measure to discrete spaces. In this case, the continuum space-time can be understood as a convenient approximation.

<sup>6</sup>Estimates of the value of the concentration function can be obtained using concentration in spheres [34, 43, 62]

$\mathcal{H}_1$  is the vector space generated by linear combinations of fundamental states. Then  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is endowed with an internal sum and scalar multiplication from the corresponding vector space structure of complex numbers  $\mathbf{C}$ , making  $\mathcal{H}_1$  a vector space over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Therefore, given two fundamental states  $\psi_A, \psi_B \in \mathcal{H}_1$  we can consider combinations of the form  $\psi_A + \lambda \psi_B \in \mathcal{H}_1$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}$  and with  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  fundamental states of the class (5.7). We can define the norm on these states as the function satisfying

$$\|\psi_A + \lambda \psi_B\|^2 := |\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + 2\lambda \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \quad (5.8)$$

and the homogeneity condition

$$\|\lambda \psi_A\|^2 = |\lambda|^2 \|\psi_A\|^2, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{C} \quad (5.9)$$

for each  $\psi_A$  fundamental state of the form (5.7). For a fundamental state, this density norm coincides with the density of phase (5.6):

$$\begin{aligned} \|2\psi_A\| &= \|\psi_A + \psi_A\|^2 = |\psi_A|^2 + |\psi_A|^2 + 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}'_A \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}'_A \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &= 2|\psi_A|^2 + 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &= 4|\psi_A|^2, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality because of the geometric condition

$$\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_{A'} = \emptyset \quad \text{if } \mathcal{O}_A \neq \mathcal{O}_{A'}.$$

Thus we have the equality

$$\|\psi_A\| = |\psi_A|. \quad (5.10)$$

To show the subadditivity property of the density norm  $\|\cdot\|$  we note that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \leq \|\psi_A\| \|\psi_B\|. \quad (5.11)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_A + \lambda \psi_B\| &\leq \sqrt{|\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + 2\lambda \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + 2\lambda \|\psi_A\| \|\psi_B\|} \\ &= \sqrt{|\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + 2\lambda \|\psi_A\| \|\psi_B\|} \\ &= \sqrt{(|\psi_A| + \lambda |\psi_B|)^2} \\ &= ||\psi_A| + \lambda |\psi_B|| \\ &\leq \|\psi_A\| + |\lambda| \|\psi_B\| \\ &= |\psi_A| + |\lambda| |\psi_B|, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality follows from the definition (5.5).

If we consider the combination of three fundamental states  $\psi_A + \lambda \psi_B + \beta \psi_C$ , then the density norm is defined to be

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_A + \lambda \psi_B + \beta \psi_C\|^2 &:= |\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + \beta^2 |\psi_C|^2 + 2\lambda \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad + 2\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad + 2\lambda\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar rule holds for arbitrary finite sums. It is remarkable that the norm must be postulated for each number of combinations of fundamental states. Thus, there is not a recursive relation of the norm of the combination of  $k$  fundamental vectors  $\|\sum_{a=1}^k \lambda_a \psi_a\|$  in terms of vectors of the norms  $\|\sum_{a=1}^{k-1} \lambda_a \psi_a\|$ .

$d\mu_0$  is a Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{F}(M_4, R)$ , the Lebesgue classes of functions of real function on  $M_4$ . For each Lebesgue class the norm of a state  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$  is defined by

$$\|\psi\|_{M_4} := \int_{M_4} d\mu_0 \|\psi\|. \quad (5.12)$$

**Proposition 5.2** *The pair  $(\mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}(M_4, R), \|\cdot\|_{M_4})$  is a complex vector normed space. A generator set is composed by all the fundamental states of the form (5.7).*

It is of relevance to find out if the norm function  $\|\cdot\|_{M_4}$  can be derived from an hermitian product and when this product defines a complete space. A positive answer to this point should provide evidence that Born's rule completely emerges from DCRS. A positive answer to of completeness is direct if the vector space  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is finite dimensional. To see this point, let us consider the *concentration maps*

$$M : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\infty, \quad \psi \mapsto |\psi|^2$$

determines a finite number of outcomes  $\{|\psi_k|^2, k = 1, \dots, N\}$ . Any finite linear complex combination  $\Psi = \sum_{\lambda=1}^r c_\lambda \psi_\lambda$  is determined by a finite number of elements in  $\{\psi_k, k = 1, \dots, N\}$ . Therefore, the set of possible norms functions  $\{|\psi_k|^2\}$  is finitely generated for the space  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Since this is the local observable, one has an effective finiteness of the vector space  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Therefore, one has the following result,

**Proposition 5.3** *The space  $(\mathcal{H}_1, \|\cdot\|_{M_4})$  is a Banach space.*

In order to go further in the analysis of the emergence of the Born's rule in DCRS, it is necessary to check if the Banach space corresponds to a Hilbert space. For this, it is sufficient to show that the polarization identity

$$2\|\psi\|_{M_4} + 2\|\phi\|_{M_4} = \|\psi + \phi\|_{M_4} + \|\psi - \phi\|_{M_4}, \quad (5.13)$$

holds for each  $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$ . We can start with a combination of the form  $\psi_A + \lambda\psi_B$ , where  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  are fundamental states and  $\lambda = \pm 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_A + \psi_B\|^2 + \|\psi_A - \psi_B\|^2 &= |\psi_A|^2 + |\psi_B|^2 + 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad + |\psi_A|^2 + |\psi_B|^2 - 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &= 2|\psi_A|^2 + 2|\psi_B|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the polarization identity (5.13) holds in this case. Similarly, we can consider combinations of the form  $\psi_A + \lambda\psi_B + \beta\psi_C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_A + \lambda\psi_B + \beta\psi_C\|^2 + \|\psi_A + \lambda\psi_B - \beta\psi_C\|^2 &= |\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + \beta^2 |\psi_C|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\lambda \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} + 2\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad + 2\lambda\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad + |\psi_A|^2 + \lambda^2 |\psi_B|^2 + \beta^2 |\psi_C|^2 + 2\lambda \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_B \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &\quad - 2\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_A \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} - 2\lambda\beta \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset} \frac{\text{vol}^2(\mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_C \cap B_r(x))}{\text{vol}^2(B_r(x))} \\ &= 2\|\psi_A + \lambda\psi_B\|^2 + 2\|\beta\psi_C\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The polarization identity (5.13) also holds in this case. It is clear that the polarization identity is true for any complex, finite combination of fundamental vectors. Therefore, we can consider the bilinear form

$$\langle, \rangle_{M_4} := \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}, \quad (\psi, \phi) \mapsto \langle \psi, \phi \rangle_{M_4} := \frac{1}{4} \left( \|\psi + \phi\|_{M_4} - \|\psi - \phi\|_{M_4} + i\|\psi + \phi\|_{M_4} - i\|\psi - \phi\|_{M_4} \right). \quad (5.14)$$

**Theorem 5.4** *The pair  $(\mathcal{H}_1, \langle, \rangle_{M_4})$  is a finite dimensional Hilbert space.*

With this result, a phenomenological Born's rule is obtained from DCRS.

**Heuristic interpretation of the quantum interference phenomena in DCRS.** We can consider the quantum two slit experiment as prototype of quantum interference phenomena [22]. In a simplified description of the two slit experiment it can be two dimensional, with the  $x$ -direction being the direction of propagation of the beam of quantum particles and  $z$ -axis on the vertical direction where the slits and the measurement screen are oriented. Furthermore, the states will be pure states, in contraposition of the density matrix. Let the state with source at the slit  $A$  be  $\psi_A$ . The slit  $B$  generates another state that we denote by  $\psi_B$ . We assume that the states  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  are fundamental states of the type described by equation (5.7). The effective state after the system pass the slits is described by a vector  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$  of the form

$$\psi = c(\psi_A + \psi_B)$$

with  $c$  a normalization real constant such that  $\|\psi\|_{M_4} = 1$ . Let us assume that  $\psi_A \neq \psi_B$ . That the states  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  should be different can be argued in several ways. For instance, the introduction of a position measurement device  $PMD$  after the slits will provide different results on the measurement pattern in the screen, depending on where the  $PMD$  is located respect to the slits  $A$  and  $B$ . Also, since the slits  $A$  and  $B$  are different, they originate states  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  that propagate independently in space-time and produce different screen patters, after a long time exposition. Therefore, it is natural to adopt the hypothesis that  $\psi_A \neq \psi_B$  in the detection screen. Furthermore, symmetry considerations imply that  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  at the central axis. Out of the central axis one expects that  $|\psi_A| \neq |\psi_B|$  or  $arg(\psi_A) \neq arg(\psi_B)$  or both conditions.

There are three qualitatively different possibilities for the final detection position pattern:

- The pattern is a bell shape centered at  $z = 0$ . This is the expected behavior if each individual systems follows a classical point dynamics.
- There is no interference pattern and the detection pattern is homogeneous.
- There is an interference pattern associated with matter wave dynamics.

We provide an heuristic argument of why the first two possibilities are excluded in DCRS by the hypothesis that  $\psi_A \neq \psi_B$  in a domain of non-zero measure as follows:

- In the first case, if the detection pattern consists of a characteristic bell shape with high density of events detected on the bells and a large region intermediate region around  $z = 0$  with large density of events detected, it implies that  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  in the intermediate region. That is, the region of accumulation of detected particles is the region where both  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  are significantly different from zero and their relative phase is small (otherwise, they will not produce well-defined doable bell curve). In contrast, in the domains of the screen without detected events ( $|z|$  large) both  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  must be null, because if not they will be arrived events detected. Therefore,  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  out of the intermediate regions. Therefore,  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  in the detector screen region, which is in contradiction with the hypothesis that  $\psi_A \neq \psi_B$  in a domain of non-zero measure in such region.
- If there is not interference detected in the screen region, a similar reasoning implies that  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  in that region: if in a given region in the screen,  $\psi_A$  was significantly different from  $\psi_B$ , they will be a concentration of events and the pattern will not be homogeneous.
- Then the only possibility left must be a consequence from  $\psi_A \neq \psi_B$ . If there is a relative phase between  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$ , one will find a interference pattern depending on the geometric arrangement of the experiment. Note that in the central region  $\psi_A = \psi_B$  by symmetry arguments, therefore generating a maximum for  $\|\psi_A + \psi_B\|^2$  in central region. As long as we move out from the axis  $z = 0$ , at least a difference on phase will appear. Otherwise, the phases  $(\theta_A, \theta_B)$  should be constant along the  $z$ -axis and there is not symmetry in the problem that implies such result. Moreover, one also expects to find a variability on the norms  $\|\psi_A\|$  and  $\|\psi_B\|$  along the  $z$ -axis.

From this heuristic discussion it follows that DCRS framework have the capability to describe quantum interference experiments: a quantum system will pass all the possibilities at the same external time  $\tau$ . In the next we explain how this can be reconcile with the measurement of observable quantities.

**Measurements in DCRS framework and interpretation of the quantum wave function.** In DCRS framework arises a natural mechanism for the quantum measurement process as follows. In order to allow the possibility of phenomenological measurability by an external observer, a DCRS must be in a *measurable state*. By this we mean a stable enough state such that an external system can properly act on it in a interaction that should determine the outcome of a measurement. Thus, it is natural to identify these stable states with the equilibrium state reached by the fundamental system by the  $U_t$  evolution. If this is the case, any physical system has a definite value of the corresponding observable before the measurement is done: there is not reduction of the state. Instead, the  $U_t$  evolution provides, after a finite internal evolution time a state with all the possible physical measurable properties well defined. The measurement could be *fast* von Neumann type or could be adiabatic (*protective type*) [4].

When this measurement mechanism is applied to quantum interference as in the two slit experiment, one concludes that the state  $\psi$  evolves in the internal time to a state that has a definite measurable location in space-time before the measurement of position is done has a definite speed simultaneously with the location, before any speed measurement is done. Therefore, if we use a detector to localize the particle just after the slits, the system will appear as localized and it will be possible to assign a *slit position* through which the system passes. The probabilities to measure the position near the slit  $A$  is  $c^2 |\psi_A|^2$  evaluated near the slit  $A$  and similarly for the slit  $B$ . This measurement must be necessarily protective. On the other hand, in the picture of the system as a DCRS previously to reach the equilibrium state, the system has passed through both slits  $A$  and  $B$  at the same external time. This is the effect of the  $U_t$  dynamics in the ergodic regime: the quantum system when it is parameterized only by the external time  $\tau$  can be spread.

Therefore, in DCRS there is an un-sharp distinction between point and particle duality, in direct conflict with the usual Bohr's complementary interpretation. The DCRS state pass through both slits  $A$  and  $B$  during the ergodic regime of the internal dynamics, but it is detected only in the equilibrium state regime. This is because when the measurement is performed, the system is already in a defined state and conversely, only when the system is in a definite state, a measurement by a macroscopic observer can be performed.

This consequence of the formalism of DCRS is against the conventional interpretation of the particle-wave duality as in Bohr complementary interpretation. However, there is experimental evidence supporting that the localization of the quantum system happens in the space-time just after the systems pass through the slits and that such localization does not disturbs the interference pattern (see for instance [51], [32], [46]), if the measurement of the position after the passing the slits does not change the quantum system.

Following this line of thought, the natural interpretation (in the sense of economical) of a wave function in DCRS is the following: a wave function describes the potentially that a system will be measure in a given position. However, the wave function is only a phenomenological device to describe an internal dynamics of a DCRS. It can be associated with an individual system but also, the wave function is not the deepest description of physical systems.

## 6 Hamiltonian boundeness and emergence of the Weak Equivalence Principle and gravitational interaction

One of the technical problems in deterministic schemes of emergent quantum mechanics is that the Hamiltonian is linear and therefore, it is problematic to have an stable ground state. We can read the Hamiltonian constraint (2.35) in the following way. Let us decompose  $\hat{H}$  in a Lipschitz component and non-Lipschitz component,

$$\hat{H}_t(u, p) = \hat{H}_{matter,t}(u, p) + \hat{H}_{lipschitz,t}(u, p). \quad (6.1)$$

From the  $U_t$  evolution, it is clear the following condition,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} (\hat{H}_{matter,t} + \hat{H}_{lipschitz,t})|\psi\rangle = 0.$$

However, each of the individual terms can be different from zero in the equilibrium state or near the equilibrium state,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \hat{H}_{matter,t}|\psi\rangle \neq 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \hat{H}_{lipschitz,t}|\psi\rangle \neq 0.$$

As a consequence of the concentration of measure phenomena, the *Lipschitz dynamics* has a remarkable property. Let us consider the center of mass of the DCRS  $M$  system  $X_{cm}(\mathcal{S})$ ,

$$X_{cm}^\mu(\mathcal{S}) = \int_{M_4} x^\mu(k) |\psi_1|^2 d\text{vol}(x). \quad (6.2)$$

In the Lipschitz regime of the internal dynamics  $U_t$ , the center of mass function  $X_{CM}$  is a Lipschitz function. If  $M$  can be decomposed as  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_A \cup \mathcal{S}_B$ , one can consider the corresponding center of mass functions for the systems  $\mathcal{S}_A$  and  $\mathcal{S}_B$ . Let us consider a metric distance function  $d : TM \times TM \rightarrow R$  in the space of configurations  $TM$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ . This metric can be, for instance, the metric defined by the Riemannian metric  $\bar{\eta}$  on  $TM$ .

**Definition 6.1** *A family of dynamics concentrates if does not depend on the individual dynamics.*

The next result makes sense only if there are two dynamics for two independent times, the internal time and the external time. For DCRS with an internal dynamics  $U_t$  and an external dynamics  $U_\tau$  it holds the following,

**Theorem 6.2** *For the same initial conditions, the Lipschitz regime of the internal dynamics  $U_t$  associated with the  $U_\tau$  evolutions of the center of mass functions  $X_{cm}(\mathcal{S})(\tau)$ ,  $X_{cm}(\mathcal{S}_A)(\tau)$ ,  $X_{cm}(\mathcal{S}_B)(\tau)$  concentrates.*

**Proof.** One can consider first to the function  $X_{CM}(\mathcal{S})(\tau)$ , for each value of the external time  $\tau$ . Then we can apply the principle. Then one can consider the particular cases when  $X_{CM}(\mathcal{S}(\tau))$  is applied to the configurations

$$A \equiv (u_1, \dots, u_{8N_A}, 0, \dots, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad B \equiv (0, \dots, 0, v_1, \dots, v_{8N_B}), \quad N = N_A + N_B.$$

If the internal time evolution is on a compact duration time and since there is a maximal speed for the fundamental degrees of freedom, the generalized configuration and phase space  $TM$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a compact manifold. For simplicity, this compact manifold can be modeled by an  $8N$ -dimensional sphere, with  $N$  large. Then one can use the concentration property for spheres [42, 62] to show that the evolution for configuration  $A$ , configuration  $B$  and any other configuration of  $\mathcal{S}$  differ by an amount bounded by

$$d(X, Y)|_\tau \sim C_1 \exp(-8C_2 N d^2(X, Y)|_{\tau=0}),$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants, not depending on the configuration and  $X, Y$  denote the center of mass position for the systems  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

In view of the strong resemblance of this universality in the dynamics with the strong *Weak Equivalence Principle* (WEP), one can make an strong assumption and postulate:

*In the equilibrium  $\hat{H}|\psi\rangle = 0$ , the Lipschitz dynamics corresponding to  $\hat{H}_{lipshitz,0}$  is the gravitational interaction.*

This is also in concordance with the fact the dynamics near the equilibrium state  $t = 0$  are diffeomorphic invariance or near diffeomorphic invariance. This two properties (diffeomorphism invariance and WEP) makes postulate an emergent origin to any gravitational interaction based on these two principles.

Conversely, if the gravitational energy in the equilibrium state  $\hat{H}|\psi\rangle = 0$  is finite and negative, the matter Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{matter}$  it will be bounded from below. In particular, one has bounded stationary states also for  $\hat{H}_{matter}$ .

## 7 Phenomenological Lagrangian representations of DCRS

We have seen that an effective description of a state in a DCRS is given by four squared densities  $\{|\psi_n|^2(x), n = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and four phases  $\{\theta_n, n = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  subject to a normalization condition (5.12). Since DCRS have associated a Lorentzian symmetry, (a natural way of implementing the causality condition A.3), one can assume that the four functions  $\{|\psi_n|^2(x), \theta_n, i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  that emerge in the effective description of the states of a DCRS combine to allow for representations of the Lorentz group  $O(1, 3)$ . Therefore, it is of relevant to consider all the possible representations of the Lorentz group that can be associated with DCRS.

Let us remind the reader that the DCRS and its phenomenological description will correspond to very high energy scales, compared with any energy scale that appear in the Standard Model (also including the energies scales of the Dualized Standard Model, for instance). Therefore, any possible mass scale of the degrees of freedom of a DCRS should be negligible with the energy scale where the  $U_t$  dynamics happen. Then the effective fields will be mass-less as first approximation. This approximation is fully compatible with the Hamiltonian



description (2.19) of DCRS systems, since the model applies to fundamental molecules composed by time-like and light-like fundamental atoms. Moreover, this is a natural property, since these fields represent the degrees of freedom for systems whose dynamics happen at a very high energy scale. Therefore, any mass parameter entering in the fundamental Lagrangian will be very small compared with any kinematical or potential terms in the Lagrangian (note that since the space-time is the background Minkowski metric, Fourier transform is naturally available. One can see the light-like atoms as zero limit description of time-like degrees of freedom. In order to obtain a theoretical scheme to investigate the phenomenological consequences of DCRS, the internal time  $t$  must be disregarded from the dynamical and kinematical description. We argue in this section a possible scheme based on the theory of representations of the Lorentz group.

Since the world-lines of the molecules  $\xi(k) : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow M_4$  are not parameterized by a constant speed parameter, one obtains a relation of the type

$$D_{\dot{\xi}} \dot{\xi} = \lambda_L \dot{\xi} + \lambda_a T_a$$

for the covariant acceleration, where  $\lambda_L, \lambda_a \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\{\dot{\xi}, T_1, T_2, T_3\}$  is a frame for  $T_{\dot{\xi}} M_4$  and with  $\lambda_a \neq 0$  in general. Thus, from the definition of the local phases (4.4), there is the following relation,

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(\theta_2) &= \eta_4(V, D_{\dot{\xi}(k)} \dot{\xi}(k)) \frac{1}{\|D_{\dot{\xi}(k)} \dot{\xi}(k)\|_{\eta_4}} \\ &= \eta_4(V, \lambda_L \dot{\xi} + \lambda_a T_a) \frac{1}{\|\lambda_L \dot{\xi} + \lambda_a T_a\|_{\eta_4}} \\ &= \lambda_L \cosh(\theta_1) \frac{\|\dot{\xi}\|}{\|\lambda_L \dot{\xi} + \lambda_a T_a\|_{\eta_4}} + \lambda_a \eta_4(V, T_a) \frac{\|1\|}{\|\lambda_L \dot{\xi} + \lambda_a T_a\|_{\eta_4}}. \end{aligned}$$

From this relation, it follows that the way  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  change under the Lorentz group are related and similarly for the other local phases. This implies necessary constraints on the representations of the Lorentz group that we are interested. In general an arbitrary representation of the Lorentz group compatible with DCRS will define a vector space of the form

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ (\psi_1 \exp(\theta_1), \psi_2 \exp(\theta_2), \psi_3 \exp(\theta_3), \psi_4 \exp(\theta_4)), |\psi|_i^2(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} |D_i(r, x)|^2, i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \right\}$$

with  $\theta_n$  given by (4.4) and with the squared densities  $|D_n(r, x)|^2$  given by the equation (5.3). Note that locality requirements avoid other combinations like  $\psi_1 \exp(\theta_2)$ , that depends of several space-time points. The physical states are the normalized vectors in  $\mathcal{H}$ . From the representation theory of the Lorentz group we have the following possibilities:

- $\mathcal{H}$  is a family of complex scalar representations,
- $\mathcal{H}$  is an irreducible two dimensional Weyl spinor representation,
- $\mathcal{H}$  is a reducible Dirac spinor representation,
- $\mathcal{H}$  is an irreducible two dimensional four-vector representation.

Higher representations could be constructed from these representations by considering products.

**Scalar sector.** The selection of a given state, determined by a  $\beta \in \Gamma TM$ , is equivalent to a spontaneous symmetry breaking. If we are in the light-like case, the symmetry is broken as

$$O(1, 3)_x \times O(1, 3)_y \rightarrow (SO(1, 1) \times U(1))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y. \quad (7.1)$$

Therefore, the appearance of scalar fields is necessary by Goldstone's theorem. Thus, the choice of a vector of the form We have shown that Lorentz invariance is spontaneously broken in DCRS. One should expect  $6 = 4 + 2$  Goldstone's bosons  $\{(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b), a = 1, 2, 3, 4; b = 1, 2\}$ , corresponding to the spontaneously broken structures

$$\begin{aligned} O(1, 3)_x &\rightarrow (SO(1, 1) \times U(1))_x \\ O(1, 3)_y &\rightarrow (SO(3) \times U(1))_y. \end{aligned}$$

The scalar fields  $\{\pi_1^a\}_{a=1}^4$  hold a representation of  $(SO(1,1) \times U(1))_x$ , while the fields  $\{\pi_2^b\}_{b=1}^2$  hold a representation of the group  $(SO(3) \times U(1))_y$ . Then the general Lagrangian for the Goldstone's sector is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_S = \sum_{a=1}^4 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_1^a)^2 + \sum_{b=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_2^b)^2 + \mathcal{V}_\pi(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \Phi^A). \quad (7.2)$$

The potential  $\mathcal{V}_\pi(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \Phi^A)$  must be constraint by the following requirements:

- It must does not contain mass terms for  $\pi_{1,2}^a$ , since the Goldstone bosons are zero modes.
- It must be invariant under the global remain symmetry  $(SO(1,1) \times U(1))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y$ .

The potential  $\mathcal{V}_\pi(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \Phi^A)$  could depend on other fields, generically denoted as  $\Phi^A$ . It is also not necessary to require renormalizability of the theory. However, it is necessary to require absence of infrared divergences.

**Fermionic sector.** For the Weyl sector, we have the standard Lagrangian for Weyl spinors plus interacting terms,

$$\mathcal{L}_W = i c_L^B (\psi_L^B)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_L^B) + c_R^B i (\psi_R^B)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_R^B) + \mathcal{V}_\psi(\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \Phi), \quad (7.3)$$

$c_L^B$  and  $c_R^B$  are constants and  $\Phi^B$  are generic fields. There are some constraints on the potential  $\mathcal{V}_\psi(\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi, \Phi^B)$

- It should not contain mass terms for the Weyl spinors  $\psi_L$  and  $\psi_B$  and also not for the Goldstone bosons  $\pi^a$  and  $\pi^b$ .
- The Fermi Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_W$  should be invariant under the global symmetry  $(SO(1,1) \times U(1))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y$ .

Similarly, there is a Dirac sector. However, we adopt the convention that the energy scale where the dynamics is happening it is high enough to consider that all the fermions are massless. Therefore, the Dirac spinor is reduced to Weyl spinors.

**Vector sector.** For the vector sector with only two degrees of freedom, the Lagrangian density corresponds to a collection of Yang-Mills fields interacting with the Goldstone scalar and Weyl spinors,

$$\mathcal{L}_{YM} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_C Tr[F_{\mu\nu}^C F_{\mu\nu}^C] + \mathcal{V}_{YM}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, F^C), \quad (7.4)$$

where the potential  $\mathcal{V}_{YM}$  do not have mass terms for the Yang-Mills fields  $F_{\mu\nu}^C$ , Weyl spinors  $(\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B)$  and Goldstone fields  $(\pi_a, \pi_b)$ . The fields  $\{\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, F^C\}$  are massless. Again, similar constraints on the potential  $\mathcal{V}_{YM}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, F^C)$  as for the the above potential should be imposed.

Therefore, the general effective Lagrangian for a DCRS has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, F^C) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_C Tr[F_{\mu\nu}^C F_{\mu\nu}^C] + \frac{1}{2} i c_L^B (\psi_L^B)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_L^B) + \frac{1}{2} i c_R^B (\psi_R^B)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_R^B) \\ &\quad + \sum_{a=1}^4 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_1^a)^2 + \sum_{b=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_2^b)^2 + \mathcal{V}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, F^C), \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

where the potential

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{YM} + \mathcal{V}_\psi + \mathcal{V}_\pi$$

is restricted by the above conditions of absence of mass terms for any of the fields and holding the global symmetry  $(SO(1,1) \times U(1))_x \times (SO(3) \times U(1))_y$ .

**Remark 7.1** We have not imposed additional constraints like renormalizability and additional symmetries to the Lagrangian densities. We leave open the possibility that additional requirement of symmetries could constraint more the Lagrangian (7.5). Such constraints are specific requirements of the theory as renormalization, supersymmetry, gauge symmetries and specific dualities. Furthermore, the Lagrangian (7.5) contain as subcases the Yang-Mills Lagrangian and the abelian gauge theory: gauge theories can be obtained as effective descriptions in DCRS. Also, note that from these three representations, only the Goldstone bosons required by construction.

**Example 7.2** The simpler Lagrangian density of the family (7.5) is

$$\mathcal{L}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b) = \sum_{a=1}^4 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_1^a)^2 + \sum_{b=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \pi_2^b)^2 + \mathcal{V}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b).$$

If the potential function is zero  $\mathcal{V}(\pi^a, \pi^b) = 0$ , the scalar model is a linear sigma model, with target space the flat Riemannian manifold  $(\mathbf{R}^6, \bar{\eta}_6)$  with

$$\vec{\pi}(x) = (\pi_1^1(x), \pi_1^2(x), \pi_1^3(x), \pi_1^4(x), \pi_2^1(x), \pi_2^2(x)) \in \mathbf{R}^6,$$

for each  $x \in M_4$ . As a generalization, one can consider the case when  $\mathcal{V}$  is homogeneous of degree two in  $\pi$  fields and the target manifold is a six dimensional Riemannian manifold  $(M_6, g_6)$ . Particularly interesting is the case when the potential  $\mathcal{V}$  can be combined with the kinetic term. Then one assumes the existence of a vector bundle  $\rho_6 : \mathcal{E}_6 \rightarrow M_4$ , whose fibers  $\rho_6^{-1}(x)$  are 6-dimensional vector spaces of the form. There is a fiber metric  $g_{10} \{ \nabla_4 \pi^a, \nabla_4 \pi^b, a = 1, \dots, 4; b = 1, 2 \}$ . Thus, we have a ten dimensional fiber bundle  $P_{4,6}$  whose base is homeomorphic to  $M_4$  and whose fibers are homeomorphic to  $(M_6, g_6)$ . The sections are  $\vec{\pi} \in \Gamma P_{4,6}$ . Then the Lagrangian density of the scalar sector can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b) = \frac{1}{2} g_6(\nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6, \nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6),$$

The invariant action is

$$\mathcal{S}_\pi = \int_{M_4} d^4x \sqrt{|\det \eta_4|} \frac{1}{2} g_6(\nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6, \nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6). \quad (7.6)$$

This model is certainly a 6-dimensional version for 4-branes of the Polyakov action of two dimensional sigma models.

**Example 7.3** We consider the following Lagrangian density,

$$\mathcal{L}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \psi_L^B, \psi_R^B) = \frac{1}{2} g_6(\nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6, \nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^4 c_L^a (\psi_L^a)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_L^a) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b=1}^2 c_R^b (\psi_R^b)^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi_R^b).$$

By re-arranging the spinor variables, this Lagrangian can be re-written as

$$\mathcal{L}(\pi_1^a, \pi_2^b, \psi) = \frac{1}{2} g_6(\nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6, \nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^6 (\bar{\psi}^a) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi^a), \quad (7.7)$$

with  $\gamma^\mu$  the Dirac matrices (four dimensions),  $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2\eta_4^{\mu\nu}$ . This Lagrangian has the following *supersymmetry invariance*,

$$\delta \pi^a = \bar{\epsilon} \psi^a, \quad \delta \psi^a = \epsilon \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \pi^a. \quad (7.8)$$

The action corresponding to this Lagrangian is

$$S[\pi, \psi] = \int_{M_4} d^4x \sqrt{|\det(\eta_4)|} \frac{1}{2} \left( g_6(\nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6, \nabla_4 \vec{\pi}_6) + \sum_{a=1}^6 \bar{\psi}^a \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu (\psi^a) \right). \quad (7.9)$$

The resemblance with the Ramond-Neveu-Schwarz action is evident, except that the world-sheet is the four dimensional space-time manifold  $M_4$  and the target space is six dimensional in the bosonic sector.

These two examples show the existence of reasonable phenomenological Lagrangian descriptions of DCRS. They have the appealing that they are geometric actions. They correspond to non-renormalizable theories and must be understood as phenomenological models. In general, the models of the *examples* (7.2) and (7.3) are non-renormalizable. However, renormalizability is not a fundamental requirement, in the context of action functional describing DCRS. This is because the degrees of freedom in the actions describe the DCRS degrees of freedom as well at the fundamental scale density. Therefore, large energy scaling invariance is not required.

It is essential for our discussion to recognize that these models do not describe the degrees of freedom of the Standard Model. Therefore, if the models in the examples 1 and 2 turn out to be acceptable as action functionals for the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale, still it left to make contact with the Standard Model.

## 8 Discussion

The relation between Cartan structures and dynamical Hamiltonian systems is well known. That the geodesic equations of a Cartan metric correspond to the Hamilton equations of an associated Hamiltonian function and viceversa was already noted before (see for instance [61]). We have shown in [25] that Hamiltonian functions linear on the momentum variables and constrained to have maximal speed and acceleration corresponds to a DCRS, as averaged of Cartan-Randers spaces. In this paper we have investigated this relation and an application to deterministic models for fundamental degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale. In this context, we should emphasize that the use of Cartan-Randers metrics in the contest of DCRS is significantly different than the application of Randers metrics as geometrization of the dynamics of point charged particles in external electromagnetic fields (for this last application, see for instance [27, 49, 50]). Indeed, our motivation to use DCRS has a strong resemblance with the motivation in the original work of G. Randers on *irreversible geometric spacetimes* [56]. In DCRS there is a fundamental, non-reversible dynamics (the  $U_t$  evolution) in an open cone of the cotangent bundle  $T^*TM$ . This irreversible dynamics is the responsible for the emergence of quantum states and the equilibrium states (also denoted as measurable states). Since it is an effective description of a large ensemble of degrees of freedom, the equilibrium state itself evolves along an external time  $\tau \in R$  which is non-compact and different from the parameter  $t$  guiding the irreversible evolution dynamics  $U_t$ . The quantum evolution  $U_\tau$  is by construction reversible, in contrast with the  $U_t$  evolution that is non-reversible and produces information loss. This information loss has its origin in a general property that appear in geometric asymptotic analysis and in the geometry of measure metric spaces known as concentration of measure [33, 34, 42, 43, 47, 48, 62]. In contrast with other deterministic approaches to quantum mechanics [9, 10, 18, 35], in our proposal there is not a direct need for the gravitational interaction to be the agent producing the fundamental information loss. Indeed, we have seen that two properties that characterize the gravitational interaction (invariance under diffeomorphism of the  $U_\tau$  dynamics in the equilibrium state and the WEP) emerge from DCRS in the mechanism of bounding the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian for matter.

A main difference between DCRS and others deterministic approaches to emergent quantum mechanics relies on the notion of time. In DCRS, time is a two-dimensional parameter  $(t, \tau) \in [0, 1] \times R$ . The parameter  $\tau$  is the external time used to describe the evolution of a quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  when interacting with the environment. This parameter time corresponds with the usual notion of *macroscopic time* used in quantum mechanics and quantum field theory. The internal time parameter  $t$  in DCRS describes the  $U_t$  internal evolution of the Hamiltonian  $H_t(u, p)$  and appears in the formalism as the parameter of the homotopy (2.4) of Cartan-Randers dynamical systems. This notion of time must be contrasted with the usual notion in other emergent deterministic approaches to quantum mechanics [2, 9, 10, 18, 35, 52]. In such approaches the notion of time is the usual one and coincides with the time parameter in quantum mechanics and field theory (except for the fact that in some of these approaches the time parameter  $\tau$  can be discrete).

In DCRS, is this notion of *two-dimensional time* parameter  $(t, \tau)$  which is beneath our interpretation of quantum mechanics as *geometric evolution*: the fundamental degrees of freedom experience a doubly dynamics, one associated with the geometric flow  $U_t$  and the second one described by the canonically quantized of the Hamiltonian (2.19). The essence of our interpretation of the fundamental non-local description of the quantum mechanics is based in the following argument. In order to speak of a measurement of an observable at an instant of time in the DCRS framework, we need to specify two parameters,  $(t, \tau) \in [0, 1] \times R$  and allow the system to be in an equilibrium state. If only the parameter  $\tau$  is specified in a dynamical description of a physical system (as it is done in usual field theory and quantum mechanics) and the system is not in an equilibrium state for the  $U_t$  dynamics, an intrinsic non-local description of the state associated with the ergodicity of the evolution emerges, in concordance with the intrinsic non-locality description of an individual system in quantum mechanics. Thus, if only the  $U_\tau$  evolution is taken into account, the phenomenological description of the DCRS must be non-local, in fully agreement with the non-locality of the quantum mechanical description, with a reduction of the state in the measurement process as a fundamental process. However, once the  $U_t$  evolution is taken into account, the quantum collapse of the wave function corresponds to the dynamical state where the system has reached the equilibrium state of the  $U_t$  dynamics. In such state, the physical system is allowed to have definite values of any observable, that are measurable.

Several consequences of the DCRS framework have been considered. Between them, we remark an emergent interpretation of the Principle of Inertia, that emerges from the fundamental dynamical structure of the DCRS framework and that is not required to be imposed from the beginning. One can also prove the emergence of the diffeomorphism invariance for the phenomenological models, that is represented by the zero modes of a quantum Hamiltonian operator at the equilibrium states. Since the local diffeomorphisms determine the pseudo-group associated with the gravitational interaction, it is natural to conjecture that in DCRS gravitation itself is an emergent phenomena. This is in concordance with the emergence of the WEP in DCRS, as we also discussed. There are well known arguments in the direction of this conjecture, as discussed by several authors (see for

instance the different theories developed by different authors [40, 39, 53, 63]). One expects that the weak equivalence principle has an emergent interpretation from systems with large number of degrees of freedom. Such emergent interpretation is based on the same principle generating the macroscopically observable states, which is the concentration of measure phenomena in measure metric spaces. If the mechanism proposed for the emergence of WEP is correct, the weak equivalence principle will not be gradually violated: for all possible energies where the degrees of freedom of the Standard Model are present, the WEP will be valid, with not observable violation before reaching the fundamental scale. However, it will be completely violate at the energy scale where the degrees of freedom correspond to molecules of a DCRS. In this case, we do not expect violation of the weak equivalence up to energies of the order of Planck energy.

A consequence from DCRS is that the covariant accelerations vectors  $D_{\xi}\dot{\xi}$  are universally bounded for each degree of freedom. If the fundamental scale is of order of the Planck scale, then the maximal acceleration associated should be of order  $a_{\text{planck}} = 10^{52}m/s^2$ . Maximal accelerations of such order are also predicted by consistency conditions in several scenarios of quantum gravity ([11, 54, 57]). Also, a maximal acceleration should have relevant implications for the absence of space-time singularities (see for instance [13, 57]). Furthermore, maximal acceleration has consequences for cosmology, specifically in recognizing a fundamental bound for acceleration and deceleration in inflation cosmology [30]. It is in this area where we expect that an universal acceleration as the Planck acceleration  $a_{\text{planck}}$  could have falsifiable predictions.

We have left unspecified the fundamental scales for length and time. It can happen that the fundamental energy scale is different from the Planck scale. If the fundamental scale is the Planck scale, the maximal acceleration is of the same order than the one found in string models and in covariant loop quantum gravity. Other possible scenario that could introduce a fundamental scale are large extra-dimension models [5], with the *minimal length* associated with the compact direction. In this case, the maximal acceleration could be as *small* as  $10^{20}m/s^2$ , which is much more accessible to observation (see for instance [23, 24] where they discuss a maximal acceleration of this order). However, in the framework of DCRS, the possibility of a large fundamental scale is not free of theoretical difficulties, since the interpretation on the phenomenological Lagrangian density (7.5) description of DCRS will fail. Also, it is difficult to accommodate such large fundamental scale dimension with diffeomorphism invariance. Therefore, a shorter fundamental scale appears favored theoretically.

We have seen that under enough regularity conditions on the vector field  $\beta$ , the classical Hamiltonian (2.19) of a DCRS is bounded when acting on measurable states. This solution of the boundless problem of linear Hamiltonian do not call for a fundamental role of gravity. Indeed, it appeals to the possibility that gravity is also emergent, in the same process of defining a bounded Hamiltonian for matter. The mechanism to bound the Hamiltonian for matters is based on an relevant mathematical fact in Mathematical Analysis, as is the concentration of measure phenomena, in particular in spheres of higher order dimension.

We have also seen how the existence of the equilibrium (or measurable states) emerge from the  $U_t$  evolution. The existence of the equilibrium states explain the measurement problem without collapse of the wave packet. The idea is the assumption that the physical system is in an equilibrium state prior to any measurement is performed. In an equilibrium state, all the possible classical observables are defined. However, the system could appear as *spread* for some classical observables, before any measurement is performed. This is because the system has an ergodic phase for the internal evolution, where the systems evolves on the full allowable classical space, before the system concentrates in an equilibrium state. Disregarding the  $U_t$  dynamics determines a non-local phenomenological description of the state, together with an apparent reduction of the wave packet, in concordance with the standard quantum theory.

There are some points worthily to be clarified further. For instance, in our basic construction of Cartan-Randers spaces we use a background Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$ . Lorentzian structures are naturally associated with an universal bound for speed. If there is also a maximal covariant proper acceleration, the natural space-time geometry is not a Lorentzian manifold but a *higher order geometry* [28]. However, in the construction of the geometry of maximal acceleration, a background Lorentzian metric was considered. Thus, in a deeper version of this theory, the Lorentzian structure should be substitute by a higher order geometry. Moreover, one hopes to obtain the still underlying Lorentzian structure  $\eta_4$  from fundamental principles as causality and locality and not as a background or fundamental structure. Therefore, a Lorentzian structure in DCRS should be understood as an element of an intermediate formulation in the way towards a full consistent formulation.

Another question to be clarified is the relation between the  $U_\tau$  dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom and the degrees of freedom used in the phenomenological description of a DCRS given by the Lagrangian densities (7.5). Although we have described the phenomenological models compatible with DCRS by associating the general type of Lagrangian density (7.5), it is necessary to have an explicit description of the map

$$\{(x^k, y^k), k = 1, \dots, 4N\} \rightarrow \{\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b F^C, a = 1, 2, 3, 4; b = 1, 2\}. \quad (8.1)$$

Indeed, there are three different dynamical systems that should be related between each other, in order for having a better predictive power. These models are based on the following collections of variables,

- The fundamental degrees of freedom, determined by the fundamental molecules of a DCRS,
- The phenomenological description of the fundamental fields as appearing in the Lagrangian density (7.5),
- The degrees of freedom of the Standard Model.

The relation between these three levels in the description of the physical systems should be clarified. It is easily recognized the difficulties of this problem, since the number of degrees of freedom in a DCRS is very large compared with the number appearing in the general Lagrangian density (7.5). Also, the character effective or phenomenological of the description of DCRS systems by the fields  $\{\psi_L^B, \psi_R^B, \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b F^C, a = 1, 2, 3, 4, b = 1, 2\}$ . However, the relation between the Lagrangian density (7.5) and the Standard Model Lagrangian should be accessible to field theory methods. We have considered two particular examples of Lagrangians, *Example 7.2* and *Example 7.3*. The first one corresponds to the case of a four dimensional (non-linear) sigma model; the second one is a four dimensional supersymmetric non-linear sigma model. These two models do not exhaust all the possible Lagrangian models that are possible phenomenological descriptions of DCRS. However, other more realistic models for the effective phenomenology of DCRS systems at the fundamental scale could be possible. In this process, it will be rather significant the implementation of further symmetries in the Lagrangian density (7.5) and consistency constraints.

Let us remark that it is a direct consequence from our formalism that the external time  $\tau$  must be a discrete parameter, in a more exact description of DCRS. This is because the external time  $\tau$  is determined by processes external quantum system, which determines a clock by regular process of the type:

$\dots \Rightarrow \text{reaching an equilibrium state} \Rightarrow \text{interaction with the ambient} \Rightarrow \text{reaching an equilibrium state} \Rightarrow \dots$

Thus, an equilibrium state evolves to the next equilibrium state in *atoms of time*  $\delta\tau$ . By applying the invariance under the Lorentz group, this implies a discretization of the full space-time. The quantum topology  $(M_4, \mathcal{B})$  discussed before is related with a discrete topology in the associated discrete space-time, being essentially the same topology. This fundamental discreteness in space-time implies to consider an non-commutative space-time formulation for DCRS. There are several possible ways to describe DCRS in a *quantum space-time*. One possible avenue is to adopt the Snyder/Yang formulation of quantum space-time, since it has the appealing of being Lorentz/Poincaré invariant. These quantum space-times have the advantage that contains in a natural way elements of maximal acceleration. The second possibility is to consider the also Lorentz invariant formulation of Fredenhagen et. al. [16] The non-Lorentzian version of the bicrossproduct quantum space-times of S. Majid [44, 45], is the third avenue that one can explore in the contest of non-commutative DCRS. Also, the relation with cellular automaton models [36, 37, 38] and other discrete models [19] can be of theoretical interest. In this direction, the models presented in 7.2 and 7.3 can be also of relevance.

Finally, we have not discussed how to interpret quantum non-locality and quantum entanglement in detail. We have also not given the details of the internal dynamics. Both questions andes remain for future research.

**Acknowledgement.** This work was partially supported by The Riemann Center for Geometry and Physics, Leibnitz University Hannover and by a PNPD fellowship by CAPES (Brazil). I would like to thank Prof. J. M. Isidro for many interesting comments.

## References

- [1] D. Acosta, P. Fernández de Córdoba, J. M. Isidro, J. L. G. Santander, *Emergent quantum mechanics as a classical, irreversible thermodynamics*, International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics, Vol. 10, No. 04 1350007 (2013).
- [2] S. L. Adler, *Statistical Dynamics of Global Unitary Invariant Matrix Models as Pre-Quantum Mechanics*, hep-th/0206120; S. L. Adler, *Probability in Orthodox Quantum Mechanics: Probability as a Postulate Versus Probability as an Emergent Phenomenon*, quant-ph/0004077.
- [3] Y. Aharonov, P. G. Bergmann and J. L. Lebowitz, *Time symmetry in the quantum process of measurement*, Physical Review B., vol. 134, no. 6, pp. 14101416 (1964).
- [4] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, *The Two-State Vector Formalism of Quantum Mechanics an Updated Review*, In: Juan Gonzalo Muga, Rafael Sala Mayato, Igo Egusquiza (eds.): Time in Quantum Mechanics, Volume 1, Lecture Notes in Physics 734, pp. 399447, 2nd ed., Springer (2008).
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *The Hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter* Physics Letters B429, 263272 (1998).
- [6] D. Bao, *On two curvature-driven problems in Riemann-Finsler geometry*, Adv. Stu. in Pure and Math., n 48, pp 19-71 (2007).
- [7] D. Bao, S. S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer-Verlag (2000).
- [8] M. V. Berry and J. P. Keating,  *$H = xp$  and the Riemann zeros*, in *Supersymmetry and Trace Formulae: Chaos and Disorder*, ed. J. P. Keating, D. E. Khemelnitskii, L. V. Lerner, Kuwler 1999; M. V. Berry and J. P. Keating, *The Riemann zeros and eigenvalue asymptotics*, SIAM REVIEWW 41 (2), 236 (1999).

- [9] M. Blasone, P. Jizba and G. Vitiello, Dissipation, *Emergent Quantization, and Quantum Fluctuations*, in Decoherence and Entropy in Complex Systems, Selected Lectures from DICE 2002, H.-T. Elze (ed.), Lecture Notes in Physics 633, Springer, Berlin (2004).
- [10] M. Blasone, P. Jizba and F. Scardigli, *Can Quantum Mechanics be an Emergent Phenomenon?*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 174 (2009) 012034, arXiv:0901.3907[quant-ph].
- [11] M. J. Bowick and S. B. Giddins, *High-Temperature Strings*, Nucl. Phys. B 325, 631 (1989).
- [12] E. R. Caianiello, *Geometry from quantum theory*, Il Nuovo Cimento, Vol. 59 B, 350-466.
- [13] E. R. Caianiello, *Is there a Maximal Acceleration*, Lett. Nuovo Cimento, 32, 65 (1981); E. R. Caianiello, *Quantum and Other Physics as Systems Theory*, La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento, Vol. 15, Nr 4 (1992)..
- [14] P. Caldirola, *A new model of classical electron*, Suplemento al Nuovo Cimento, Vol. III, Serie X, 297-343 (1956).
- [15] P. Caldirola, *On the existence of a maximal acceleration in the relativistic theory of the electron*, Lett. Nuovo Cimento, 32, 264-266 (1981).
- [16] S. Doplicher, ; K. Fredenhagen and J. E. Roberts, *The quantum structure of spacetime at the Planck scale and quantum fields*, Commun. Math. Phys. 172 (1), 187220 (1995).
- [17] A. Connes, *Trace formula in noncommutative geometry and the zeros of the Riemann zeta function*, Selecta Mathematica (New Series) 5, 29 (1999), math.NT/9811068.
- [18] H.T. Elze *Quantum mechanics emerging from "timeless" classical dynamics*, Trends in General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology, ed. C.V. Benton (Nova Science Publ., Hauppauge, NY, 79-101 (2006); H.T. Elze, *The Attractor and the Quantum States*, Int. J. Qu. Info.7, 83 (2009); H.T. Elze, *Symmetry Aspects in Emergent Quantum Mechanics*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 171, 012034 (2009).
- [19] H. T. Elze, *Action principle for cellular automata and the linearity of quantum mechanics*, arXiv:1312.1615 [quant-ph].
- [20] H. Everett III, *Relative state formulation of quantum mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 29, 454 (1957).
- [21] P. Fernández de Córdoba, J. M. Isidro and Milton H. Perea, *Emergence from Irreversibility*, arXiv:1210.7785 [math-ph]; P. Fernández de Córdoba, J. M. Isidro and Milton H. Perea, *Emergent quantum mechanics as a thermal ensemble*, arXiv:1304.0293 [math-ph].
- [22] R. Feynman, R. B. Leighton and M. Sands, *The Feynman lectures on Physics*, Ad. Wesley (1964).
- [23] Y. Friedman and E. Resin, *Dynamics of hydrogen-like atom bounded by maximal acceleration*, Physica Scripta, 86, 015002 (2012).
- [24] Y. Friedman and T. Scarr, *Covariant uniform acceleration*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series 437, 012009 (2013).
- [25] R. Gallego Torromé, *A Finslerian version of 't Hooft Deterministic Quantum Models*, J. Math. Phys. 47, 072101 (2006).
- [26] R. Gallego Torromé, *Averaged structures associated to a Finsler structure*, math.DG/0501058; R. Gallego Torromé and F. Etayo, *On a rigidity condition for Berwald Spaces*, RACSAM 104 (1), 69-80, 2010; R. Gallego Torromé, *On the convex invariance in Finsler geometry*, Symmetry: Culture and Science, Volume 23, Number 2, 133-140, 2012.
- [27] R. Gallego Torromé, *Averaged Lorentz Dynamics and an application in Plasma Dynamics*, arXiv:0912.0183.
- [28] R. Gallego Torromé, *Geometry of generalized higher order fields and applications to classical linear electrodynamics*, arXiv:1207.3791; R. Gallego Torromé, *A second order differential equation for a point charged particle*, arXiv:1207.3627.
- [29] R. Gallego Torromé and P. Piccione, *The Lie group structure of pseudo Finsler isometries*, accepted in Houston Journal of Mathematics (2014).
- [30] M. Gasperini, *Very early cosmology in the maximal acceleration hypothesis*, Astrophysics and Space Science, vol. 138, 387-391 (1987).
- [31] A. A. Giannopoulos and V. Milman, *Concentration property on probability spaces*, Advances in Mathematics 156, 77-106 (2000).
- [32] D.M. Greenberger and A. Yasin, *Simultaneous wave and particle knowledge in a neutron interferometer*, Physics Letters A 128, 3914 (1988).
- [33] M. Gromov, *Riemannian structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Birkhäuser (1999).
- [34] M. Gromov and V. D. Milman, *A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality*, Amer. J. Math. 105, 843-854 (1983).
- [35] G. 't Hooft, *Determinism and Dissipation in Quantum gravity*, hep-th/0003005; G. 't Hooft, *How does God play dies?(Pre-) Determinism at the Planck Scale*, hep-th/0104219; G. 't Hooft, *A mathematical theory for deterministic quantum mechanics*, Conference Series, Volume 67, Issue 1, pp. 012015 (2007); Gerard't Hooft, *The mathematical basis for deterministic quantum mechanics*, ITP-UU-06/14, SPIN-06/12, quant-ph/0604008; G. 't Hooft, *Emergent Quantum Mechanics and Emergent Symmetries*, 13th International Symposium on Particles, Strings, and Cosmology-PASCOS 2007. AIP Conference Proceedings, Volume 957, pp. 154-163 (2007).
- [36] G. 't Hooft, *Duality between a deterministic cellular automaton and a bosonic quantum field theory in 1+1 dimensions*, TP-UU-12/18; SPIN-12/16, arXiv:1205.4107.
- [37] G. 't Hooft, *Discreteness and Determinism in Superstrings*, ITP-UU-12/25; SPIN-12/23, arXiv:1207.3612.
- [38] G. 't Hooft, *The fate of the quantum*, arXiv:1311.2787 [quant-ph].
- [39] B. L. Hu, *Emergent/quantum gravity: macro/micro structures of spacetime*, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 174 012015 (2009).
- [40] T. Jacobson, *Thermodynamics of space-time: The Einstein equation of state*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1260 (1995).
- [41] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* Vol. 2 (3rd ed.), Pergamon Press (1971).
- [42] M. Ledoux, *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon*, American Mathematical Society (2001).
- [43] P. Levy, *Problèmes concrets d'Analyse Fonctionnelle*, Gauthier-Villard, Paris (1951).

- [44] S. Majid, *Hopf Algebras for Physics at the Planck Scale*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 5, 1587-1607 (1988).
- [45] S. Majid and H. Ruegg, *Bicrossproduct Structure of the  $k$ -Poincare Group and Non-Commutative Geometry*, *Phys. Lett. B.* 334, 348-354 (1994).
- [46] R. Menzel et. al. *Wave-particle and complementarity un-ravelled by a different mode*, *pnas.1201271109*, PNAS May 24 (2012).
- [47] V. D. Milman, *A new proof of the theorem of A. Dvoretzky on sections of convex bodies*, *Func. Anal. Appl* 5, 28-37 (1971).
- [48] V. D. Milman, *Topics in asymptotic geometric analysis*, *Visions in Mathematics, Geometric And Functional Analysis, Special Volume*, 792-815 (2000).
- [49] R. Miron, *Finsler-Lagrange Spaces with  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -Metrics and Ingarden Spaces*, *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, Vol. **58**, 417 (2006).
- [50] R. Miron, D. Hrimiuc, H. Shimada and V. Sabau, *The Geometry of Hamilton and Lagrange Spaces*, *Fundamental Theories in Physics* 118, Kluwer (2001).
- [51] P. Mittelstaedt, A. Prieur and R. Schieder, *Unsharp particle-wave duality in a photon split-beam experiment* *Foundations of Physics* 17 (9): 891903 (1987).
- [52] E. Nelson, *Derivation of the Schrödinger equation from Newtonian Mechanics*, *Phys. Rev.* 150 1079-1083 (1964); *Dynamical theories of brownian motion*, Princeton University Press (1967); *Quantum Fluctuations*, Princeton University Press (1985).
- [53] T. Padmanabhan, *Gravity from space-time thermodynamics*, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* 285, 407 (2003); T. Padmanabhan, *Entropy density of spacetime and thermodynamic interpretation of field equations of gravity in any diffeomorphism invariant theory*, *arXiv:0903.1254*.
- [54] R. Parentani and R. Potting, *Accelerating Observer and the Hagedorn Temperature*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 945 (1989).
- [55] R. Penrose, *On Gravity's Role in Quantum State Reduction*, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, Vol. 8, No. 5, 581 (1996); R. Penrose, *The Road to Reality*, Vintage, London (2005).
- [56] G. Randers, *On an Asymmetrical Metric in the Four-Space of General Relativity*, *Phys. Rev.* **59**, 195-199 (1941).
- [57] C. Rovelli and F. Vidotto, *Evidence for maximal acceleration in covariant loop gravity and singularity resolution*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 111, 091303 (2013).
- [58] L. Smolin, *On the Nature of Quantum Fluctuations and their Relation to Gravitation and the Principle of Inertia*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 3, 347 (1986).
- [59] L. Smolin, *Could quantum mechanics be an approximation to another theory?*, *quant-ph/0609109*.
- [60] H. S. Snyder, *Quantized Space-Time*, *Phys. Rev.* 71 (1), 38-41 (1947).
- [61] J. L. Synge, *Relativity: The Special Theory*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1965).
- [62] M. Talagrand, *A new look at independence*, *Ann. Probab.* Volume 24, Number 1, 1-34 (1996).
- [63] E. P. Verlinde, *On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton*, *JHEP* 04, 29 (2011).
- [64] L. Vaidman, *The two-state vector Formalism*, *arXiv:0706.1347 [quant-ph]*.
- [65] S. Watanabe, *Symmetry of physical laws. Part III. Prediction and retrodiction*, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 27.2, 179 (1955).
- [66] J. A. Wheeler and R. F. Feynman, *Interaction with absorbers as the mechanism of radiation*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* Vol. 17, 157 (1945); J. A. Wheeler and R. F. Feynman, *Classical Electrodynamics in Terms of Direct Interparticle Action*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* Vol. 21, 425 (1949).